THE ROLE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA IN THE FORMATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

A THESIS
Submitted to
THE HARTFORD SEMINARY FOUNDATION
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dorris Aldo Flesner
Hartford, Connecticut
May 1956

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

By Dorris A. Flesner

THE ROLE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA IN THE FORMATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Five of the sixteen American Lutheran general bodies, representing about 52% of the nearly seven million Lutheran church members in the United States and Canada, are affiliated with the World Council of Churches [WCC].

The General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the U.S.A. shared actively in early deliberations of Faith and Order but withdrew in 1917 in protest against an undue emphasis on apostolic succession and a naive attitude toward the Roman Church. The United Lutheran Church in America, which in 1920 adopted a pioneering statement of principles dealing with cooperative Christian movements, was officially represented at Stockholm, Lausanne and Edinburgh but withdrew representation from Oxford because of Life and Work's continuing policy of co-opting members. The Augustana Synod sent delegates to Stockholm, Oxford and Edinburgh and was the first American Lutheran body to join the World Council.

Lutheran churches of America affiliated with the National Lutheran Council [NLC], in cooperation with the Allgemeine Lutherische Konferenz, were largely responsible for calling the first world gathering of Lutherans which in 1923 formed

the Lutheran World Convention LWC . American Lutherans in 1936 drew up a statement on "Lutherans and Ecumenical Movements" which was adopted by the LWC Executive Committee. At Utrecht in 1938 American Lutheran delegates to the WCC's constitutional conference unsuccessfully sought to have representation in the Council implemented along confessional lines. On September 6, 1945 the eight NLC churches joined in a petition for confessional representation. The LWC, renewed following World War II largely as a result of American Lutheran efforts, supported the petition. At a meeting of the WCC's Committee on Arrangements for the First Assembly an amendment was agreed upon which has completely changed the method of representation.

Three of the eight American Lutheran bodies joining in the September 1945 petition failed to move on to membership in the World Council. The Suomi Synod took no further action with reference to the Council. The Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Free Church rejected proposals for membership on the ground that affiliation would constitute a unionism forbidden by Scripture. Holding that a formal association between churches adhering to different doctrinal positions involves a compromising of revealed truth which can only result in a confused and ineffective witness, they chose to remain aloof from the Council. The American Lutheran Church, the Augustana Synod, the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church and the United Lutheran Church in America shared in the formal organization of the World Council in 1948. This thesis deals only with the eight National Lutheran Council churches and their antecedents.

Contributions to ecumenical organization and polity which can be attributed, in part at least, to the influence of American Lutherans include: (1) the policy of "receiving" rather than "adopting" reports, which avoids the suggestion of a unity not yet achieved and enables the Council to speak out more freely in prophetic witness; (2) a reaffirmation of the representative principle which helped establish the WCC as a council of responsible churches and not just an organization of individuals interested in Christian unity; (3) a statement on the nature and purpose of the WCC in which it is clearly set forth that the Council is not nor is it to become a super-church with centralized administrative authority; (4) the relating of all departments, divisions and agencies of the Council primarily to member churches rather than to area organizations, agencies or movements; and (5) a method of representation which gives due recognition to the confessional principle, assures full freedom of association within the framework of the Council, and more fully establishes the Council as a voluntary fellowship of churches associated for the purpose of promoting an ecumenical consciousness, cooperative study and the facilitation of joint action.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

VITA iv

PREFACE. v

CHAPTER

I. EARLY PARTICIPATION IN THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER BY LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA. 1

II. AMERICAN LUTHERANS ON THE ROAD TO THE WORLD COUNCIL, FROM GENEVA TO EDINBURGH, 1920-1937 . 20

III. A COMMON APPROACH TO PARTICIPATION IN ECUMENICAL MOVEMENTS BY THE LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF THE WORLD. 66

IV. AMERICAN LUTHERAN PARTICIPATION IN THE UTRECHT CONFERENCE 84

V. EARLY RESPONSES TO THE WORLD COUNCIL INVITATION BY LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA . . 92

VI. RENEWAL OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD CONVENTION . . . 119

VII. THE LUTHERAN PETITION IN BEHALF OF CONFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION. 125

VIII. SUCCESSFUL EFFORTS TO SECURE APPROVAL OF THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN PETITION IN BEHALF OF CONFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION. 133

IX. AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCHES AFFILIATING WITH THE WORLD COUNCIL AFTER APPROVAL OF THE HORSHAM AMENDMENT 162

X. COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP REJECTED. 175

XI. AMERICAN LUTHERANS AT AMSTERDAM. 216

XII. AN EVALUATION OF THE ROLE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA IN THE FORMATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES. 227

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS. 245

NOTES. 246

APPENDICES 296

I. LUTHERAN STATEMENTS OF PRINCIPLES

THE ULCA'S WASHINGTON DECLARATION, 1920 296

THE LWC'S STATEMENT ON "LUTHERANS AND ECUMENICAL MOVEMENTS" 306

EXCERPT FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS THESES 312

II. MINUTES AND REPORTS OF ECUMENICAL ORGANIZATIONS

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THIRTY-FIVE. 313

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO WHICH THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THIRTY-FIVE WAS REFERRED . . 316

ARTICLE V OF THE PROVISIONAL CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES 318

ARTICLE V OF THE WORLD COUNCIL CONSTITUTION AS APPROVED BY THE FIRST ASSEMBLY, 1948. 320

MEMORANDUM ON CONFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION PREPARED FOR THE PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE MEETING, FEBRUARY 1946 322

EXCERPT FROM MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1946 MEETING OF THE PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE 324

EXCERPT FROM MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS, HORSHAM, 1946. 325

1947 STATEMENT ON THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES 330

EXCERPT FROM DOCUMENTS FOR THE FIRST ASSEMBLY, AMSTERDAM, 1948. 331

III. ARTICLES, LETTERS, MEMORANDA

KNUBEL'S LETTER TO WESTMAN, 1922 333

KNUBEL'S LETTER ASKING WENTZ TO DRAW UP A STATEMENT ON LUTHERANS AND ECUMENICAL MOVEMENTS, 1936 336

MEMORANDUM OF ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BAPTIST WORLD ALLIANCE, 1938 338

DR. WENTZ'S "BRIEF" ON CONFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED TO THE PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 1946. 340

BISHOP BERGGRAV'S MEMORANDUM CONCERNING CONFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION 343

MICHELFELDER: WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY ECUMENICAL? . . 345

IV. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES 348

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 354

VITA

Dorris Aldo Flesner, son of Ehmes John Flesner and Anna Margaret Buss, was born on January 26, 1915 at La Prairie, Illinois. He attended the public schools of Adams County Illinois, graduating from the Golden Community High School in 1932. Majoring in philosophy at Carthage College, Carthage, Illinois, he received the B.A. degree in 1936. Following three years of study at Hamma Divinity School in Springfield, Ohio, he received the B.D. degree in 1939. Having been awarded the Victor Tressler University Scholarship by Hamma Divinity School and an exchange scholarship by the Institute of International Education he went to Europe soon after his graduation from the Seminary. In July of 1939 he attended the World Conference of Christian Youth in Amsterdam and the following month the Ecumenical Luther Academy at Sondershausen, Germany. Being unable to pursue his studies at the University of Erlangen because of the outbreak of World War II, he returned to the United States, continuing his studies at the University of Chicago. On June 30, 1940 he was ordained to the ministry of the United Lutheran Church in America. After pastorates at Elkader, Iowa and Gary, Indiana he has since 1944 been pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church in Valparaiso, Indiana. On July 17, 1940 he was married to Miss Ruth Louise Flack of Springfield, Ohio. They have three children, Paul Ellsworth 1941, David Edwin 1944, and Lois Anne 1946. Continuing his studies in connection with his pastoral work the writer received the S.T.M. degree from the Wartburg Theological Seminary of the American Lutheran Church, Dubuque, Iowa in 1950 and the M.A. degree from the University of Chicago in 1953. The subject of his S.T.M. thesis was "The Influence of Halle Pietism on the Lutheran Church in Colonial America." The subject of his M.A. thesis was "The Galesburg Rule: A Study of Lutheran Exclusivism." Granted a leave of absence by his congregation he spent full time in resident study at the Hartford Seminary Foundation 1954-1955.

THE PREFACE

There are sixteen Lutheran church bodies in America.[1] Some of them played no role whatsoever in the formation of the World Council of Churches. Some played a role far greater than is generally realized. This thesis deals with the role of the eight Lutheran churches of America, all members of the National Lutheran Council, whose representatives took joint action at a September 6, 1945 meeting in Columbus, Ohio which had been called "for the purpose of achieving a common understanding with reference to the World Council of Churches." The Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, was also represented at the Columbus meeting, but its representatives declined to join in any action in regard to the World Council.

Not all of the National Lutheran Council churches moved on to affiliate with the World Council of Churches. Five of them accepted membership. One took no further action. The remaining two took action refusing membership in the Council. The deliberations of these last two churches will be reviewed at considerable length in order to help understand the hesitancy with which Lutheran churches approach possible affiliation with ecumenical organizations. A longer consideration will be given to deliberations which not only led to the acceptance of membership in the World Council of Churches under certain stipulated conditions, but which deliberations even helped to mold the very character and direction of the World Council itself.

---

[1] The sixteen Lutheran church bodies in America together with their 1953 membership totals are as follows. The first eight are members of the National Lutheran Council: American Evangelical Lutheran Church, 21,106; American Lutheran Church, 824,535; Augustana Lutheran Church, 499,640; Evangelical Lutheran Church, 919,840; Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church (Suomi Synod), 30,883; Lutheran Free Church, 65,904; United Evangelical Lutheran Church 53,929; United Lutheran Church in America, 2,143,372. Members of the Synodical Conference are: the Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 322,947; Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, 1,916,510; Norwegian Synod, 11,027; Slovak Synod, 20,808. The remaining four, unassociated in any group, are the Lutheran Brethren, 3,929; the Eielsen Synod, 1,550; the Finnish Apostolic Church, 16,293; and the Finnish National Church, 8,684.

No reference is made in this thesis, except perhaps incidentally, to the Lutheran churches of America which are affiliated with the Synodical Conference or to the four independent bodies, none of them having played any role in the formation of the World Council of Churches. The attitude of the churches of the Synodical Conference with reference to ecumenical movements is dealt with in a 1954 doctoral thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of Basel by Pastor G. A. Thiele, who is now on the faculty of the Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri.

In this thesis the expression "American Lutheran" is used to refer to the Lutheran churches of America in general and not just to the one church body which bears the official title "American Lutheran Church." Whenever reference is made to this specific church body it will be clearly so indicated.

This thesis is based largely on Minutes, official reports, documents and publications of the World Council of Churches and its antecedent organizations and of the various Lutheran churches of America, and on vital correspondence by key figures in the churches and in the ecumenical movements.

Much of the research was carried on by use of the microfilming method. Especially valuable was a small Leica camera together with a four-legged Leica "Hilfsgerät" (Din A4, Din A5, and Din A6) which served as very convenient and effective portable equipment for microfilming letters, documents, and other materials.

The writer had free access to the personal files of Dr. Abdel Ross Wentz of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, outstanding churchman, church historian and a key figure in Lutheran deliberations on ecumenical questions as well as an active participant in Lutheran and ecumenical organizations. Conversations with him caused many of the important events to live again with radiant glow.

The "Lutheran file" of the New York office of the WCC, containing correspondence of basic significance, further provided much primary source material. Minutes and reports of the Council and its committees and of special meetings held before and after its provisional organization were made available for study and ready reference.

Invaluable also was the assistance of the Director of Research of the National Lutheran Council, Miss Helen Knubel. Daughter of the late Dr. F. H. Knubel, pioneer in American Lutheran deliberations on ecumenical questions, and herself a delegate to the Second Assembly of the World Council at Evanston, her interest and assistance proved to be especially helpful. The materials being gathered in the National Lutheran Council Library in New York City, including files of Minutes and official publications of the Lutheran bodies of America, will increasingly serve as a research center for the student of American Lutheran church history.

The Minutes of the Executive Board of the United Lutheran Church in America, on file at the Church House in New York, helped to establish some important points of information.

Also helpful in locating materials was Miss Myrtle A. Cline, formerly librarian of the William Adams Brown Ecumenical Library in New York and now at the Hartford Seminary Foundation library.

Correspondence with Dr. Floyd W. Tomkins, from 1927 to 1937 a member of the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order and for many years Associate Secretary in America of the World Conference, provided most helpful information and evaluations.

Very helpful was the suggestion of Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, president of the ULCA and chairman of the WCC's Central

Committee, that a thorough study be made of the arguments relative to possible World Council membership which were advanced at considerable length in the 1946 to 1948 deliberations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Above all, the writer acknowledges with deepest appreciation the assistance and direction of his ordinarius, Dr. Matthew Spinka, chairman of the Council for Advanced Studies of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, who suggested the study which has been made, and of Dr. Ford Battles, secretary of the Council and supervisor of theses, who also served as adviser.

CHAPTER I

EARLY PARTICIPATION IN THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER BY LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA

A. Introduction

When the World Council of Churches was officially constituted at Amsterdam on August 23, 1948, five American Lutheran church bodies were included in its membership. They were the American Lutheran Church, the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America,[1] the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America,[2] the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Lutheran Church in America. Except for the Augustana Synod and the United Lutheran Church, participation in ecumenical efforts by the above named American Lutheran bodies had only recently been initiated. During the early years of ecumenical developments which were to eventuate in the World Council of Churches it was especially in the ULCA and its antecedent bodies that the question of participation in interdenominational organizations was extensively deliberated.

At the World Missionary Conference held at Edinburgh in 1910 representatives of four American Lutheran mission boards were in attendance, namely those of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America, the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South, and the Lutheran Free Church.

Invitations to share in the calling of a World Conference on Faith and Order went out to the Augustana Synod, the General Synod, the General Council, the United Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, the United Synod South, the Joint Synod of Ohio, and the Synodical Conference.[3] Of these only the first four even acknowledged the invitation. The United Norwegian Lutheran Church replied that in view of its efforts to bring about a union among all Norwegian Lutherans in the United States it was not disposed to take any action looking to a wider unity until it had succeeded at this point. The response of the other three will be considered at greater length.

B. The Augustana Synod

On April 4, 1911 Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, secretary of the Joint Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church, wrote to the president of the Augustana Synod asking how that Synod might best be approached with reference to the proposed World Conference. He asked whether the Synod had any special committee to which an official invitation might be sent or whether it should be addressed to the president.[4]

Dr. Eric Norelius replied immediately, stating that the Augustana Synod was not inclined to consider acceptance of the Faith and Order invitation. It had no committee with authority to deal with proposals for church union, nor would it likely appoint such a committee. While deeply interested in Christian unity, it could not look favorably upon the type of outward union of the various churches as proposed by the Protestant Episcopal Commission.[5]

Dr. Norelius' attitude toward the Faith and Order overature was probably in part molded by Augustana's unhappy experience with Protestant Episcopal efforts to enlist into its membership the Lutheran immigrants from Sweden. In 1867 an Episcopal bishop had visited Sweden with the express purpose of trying to have the Church of Sweden direct its immigrating sons and daughters to the Episcopal Church in America, this in spite of the fact that the Augustana Synod was already organized and active on the field. The Augustana Minutes for 1901 and 1907 refer to the "proselyting" efforts of the Episcopalians. That Dr. Norelius should look upon the Faith and Order proposals as just another effort to win Scandinavian Lutherans into the Episcopal fold is not surprising.[6] Augustana was to have no relationship to the Faith and Order movement for many years to come. As a member of the General Council it was to have a few representatives on the Council's

Committee on Faith and Order, the activity of which will be noted below.

C. The General Council

The General Council also declined the invitation to participate in Faith and Order deliberations. In reply to a letter from Mr. Gardiner President T. E. Schmauk expressed full agreement with the Faith and Order premise that "the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement of those things in which we differ, as well as of those things in which we are one." However, he took sharp issue with the inclination to place "faith" and "order" on the same essential plane. With reference to Christ's oft quoted prayer for unity it was his opinion that Jesus was not praying for organizational unity, nor did Jesus' prayer imply that there should be in the world but one united visible church. He could not agree that the external divisions of Protestantism are a "disgrace" as long as the differences which divide are matters of faith and conscience. Without unity of faith an external union of the various churches is not even desired. He warned that mere "agreement to agree" would not constitute any real unity.[7]

The 1911 convention of the General Council, held at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, September 14-19, endorsed the stand which had been taken by Dr. Schmauk and approved his recommendation that the Faith and Order invitation together with all pertinent correspondence be referred to a committee which would study the plans and purposes of the new movement and report back to the next convention.[8]

In his president's report two years later Dr. Schmauk called attention to the declaration of principles which the General Council had adopted in 1907 in regard to the possibility of closer relations with other churches. He quoted at some length from this statement in which was expressed the willingness "to cooperate for the saving of souls and the upbuilding of Christ's kingdom" where this can be done without compromising the church's witness to the Gospel as believed and taught in the Lutheran church.[9]

The special committee to which the Faith and Order invitation had been referred brought in a report including recommendations which were approved by the 1913 convention. The General Council's concern for Christian unity and its interest in a possible World Conference was affirmed. At the same time attention was called to the essential unity which already exists among all true believers. Objection was voiced against the movement's placing faith and order on the same level of importance. It was urged that primary consideration in unity efforts be given to questions of faith and that questions touching order be relegated to the secondary place which it deserved. Furthermore, attention should be given to intra-confessional unity before moving on to a more comprehensive unity between the various denominations.

It was voted to decline the invitation to join in the calling of a World Conference on Faith and Order for the following reasons: (1) Because it was felt that the subject of Faith and Order needed a more thorough and free discussion in public print before a conference with but limited time for deliberation could be of benefit. (2) Because the General Council was and would continue to be constitutionally unable to unite with churches differing from it in faith, or with churches placing order on the same level of importance as faith. (3) Because a synthesis of Protestantism and Romanism or of evangelical Protestantism and rationalistic Protestantism, which seemed to be envisioned in the movement, was neither possible nor desirable. While declining participation in Faith and Order a "Committee on the Unity of Faith" was authorized which would have the responsibility of setting forth the Lutheran position whenever the opportunity for such a witness would arise.[10]

No further official action relative to the Faith and Order movement was ever taken by the General Council. At its 1915 convention Dr. Schmauk briefly reviewed developments in the movement including plans for the forthcoming North American Preparatory Conference.[11] At the 1917 convention he reported that he had received an inquiry from the secretary of of the World Conference asking whether the General Council's 1913 provision for a committee on the Unity of Faith were still in effect, which inquiry he had referred to the Council's Committee on Faith and Order. The insignificant role of the committee to which the inquiry was referred as well as the Council's lack of sympathy for the Faith and Order movement is indicated by the committee's failure to make any kind of a report either to the 1915 or the 1917 conventions. The General Council, which in 1875 had adopted the so-called "Galesburg Rule" providing that Lutheran pulpits be strictly limited to Lutheran pastors and Lutheran altars to Lutheran communicants, was not yet ready to play any role in the early stages of the developing ecumenical movement.[12]

D. The General Synod

The General Synod was the first Lutheran body to approve participation in the Faith and Order movement. Action in this direction was taken at its June 7-14, 1911 convention held in Washington, D.C.[13] On February 20, 1911, just three months after the Protestant Episcopal Church had voted to authorize a "Joint Commission to Arrange for a World Conference on Faith and Order," a representative of that commission had presented its proposals to the Lutheran Social Union in Philadelphia.[14] When the Joint Committee's Committee on Plan and Scope published its first report in July 1911 it noted that the General Synod had already taken favorable action and had appointed a five-man commission.[15]

At "A First Preliminary Conference" held in the Hotel Astor in New York City on May 8, 1913 by representatives of the churches having indicated their willingness to share in the calling of a World Conference Dr. Junius Remensnyder of the General Synod was one of the active participants. Opening discussion at the meeting following a preliminary report on the progress of the movement he raised the question as to why the churches of Germany and Scandinavia had not as yet been sent an invitation, especially since communications had already gone out to the churches in England, Scotland and Wales as well as to the American churches. Secretary Gardiner in explaining that the delay was due in part to his ignorance of church conditions on the European continent asked Dr. Remensnyder to help supply the necessary names and addresses.[16]

Later at the Preliminary Meeting Dr. Remensnyder, in the longest statement recorded in the report of proceedings, set forth what he considered to be the goal before the projected World Conference. He insisted that a mere "spiritual unity" or even a federation of churches would not be enough. The goal should be nothing short of the organic unity of all Christian churches of the world.[17] Also striking, because of its unrealistic appraisal of the nature of Roman Catholicism, was his idea that the organic union of Protestant churches would give Rome "a different respect for the conception of Protestantism" with the result that Protestants "would be in a situation to offer terms and to seek final union" with the Roman Catholic Church.[18]

Dr. Remensnyder was not speaking for the General Synod which he represented when he stated that Lutherans might possibly be willing to follow a policy of compromise in order to help achieve a united Christendom. Noting that the matter of church government is of secondary importance to Lutherans he suggested that they might indeed, without any violation of conscience, be inclined to give in to those insisting on episcopacy as the necessary form of organization in a future united church. Similarly it was his opinion that in regard to ceremonies, liturgies, and litanies they might also be willing to adopt forms demanded as essential by others. He insisted on the central importance of questions of faith but his reference to "essentials" and "fundamental questions" left the door open to the possibility of compromise even at this point.[19]

In presenting the commission's report to the 1913 convention of the General Synod Dr. Remensnyder spoke in glowing terms of the Preliminary Conference held earlier that year. The commission's recommendation that participation in the Faith and Order movement be continued was approved.[20] Similar approval was voted by the 1915 convention.[21]

With plans for holding a World Conference at an early date interrupted by the war in Europe the Joint Commission decided to hold a North American Preparatory Conference so that some continuing effort might be carried on in behalf of Faith and Order. This Conference, attended by sixty-three delegates representing fifteen churches was held at Garden City, Long Island, January 4-6, 1916.[22] While at previous meetings the General Synod had been represented only by Dr. Remensnyder,[23] all five members of the Synod's commission attended the Garden City meeting, some of them participating actively in the program. Dr. Remensnyder addressed the delegates on "The Basis of the Invitation to the World Conference."[24] Dr. F. P. Manhart was asked to introduce John R. Mott as moderator of one of the sessions while Dr. J. A. Singmaster served as moderator for the closing session.[25]

At the January 1916 meeting the progress of efforts in behalf of Faith and Order was reported, plans laid outlining future procedure and subjects for deliberation by the first

World Conference discussed. A platform was adopted on which it was thought the various churches could cooperate in the new movement for unity, its opening paragraph reading as follows:

> The basis of the proposed world conference is the faith of the whole Church, as itself created by Christ, resting on the incarnation and continued from age to age by His indwelling life until He comes.[28]

In the progress report presented at the opening of the Conference a prominent place was given to correspondence between the Joint Commission and representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. It was reported that an unsuccessful effort had been made to secure the attendance of Cardinal James Gibbons at the meeting, friendly letters having been exchanged. More dramatic in its effect upon the Conference was the reading and publicizing of correspondence with the Vatican itself. Attention was directed especially to the following letter which had been written on December 18, 1914 by the papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Gaspari:

> Your project of an international convention of all who believe in Jesus Christ as God and Saviour to accomplish the speedy fulfillment of the final prayer of the Lord, that all may be one, I have, in obedience to your request, submitted to the most blessed Father.
>
> I need not here describe the affection with which I saw the august pontiff kindled for you.
>
> For you well know that the plans of the Roman pontiffs, their cares and their labors, have always been specially directed to the end that the sole and unique Church which Jesus Christ ordained and sanctioned with

> His divine blood should be most zealously guarded and maintained, whole, pure and ever abounding in love, and that it should both let its light shine and open wide its door for all who rejoice in the name of man and who desire to gain holiness upon earth and eternal happiness in heaven.
>
> The august pontiff, therefore, was pleased with your project of examining in a sincere spirit and without prejudice the essential form of the Church, "or the inner essence of the church".
>
> He earnestly hopes that under the spell of its native beauty you may settle all disputes and work with prosperous issue to the end that the mystical body of Christ be no longer suffered to be rent and torn, but that by harmony and co-operation of men's minds and likewise by the concord of their wills, unity of faith and communion may at last prevail throughout the world of men.
>
> Thanking you, then, that you have thought well to request the aid and support of the Roman pontiff in expediting your worthy project, his Holiness expresses his earnest desire that the end may answer your expectation.
>
> He asks the same of Christ Jesus with fervent prayers, all the more because, with the voice of Christ Himself sounding before and bidding him, he knows that he himself, as the one to whom all men have been given over to be fed, is the source and cause of the unity of the Church.[27]

Some of the members of the Joint Commission having interpreted the above letter as a friendly gesture from the Pope, carrying with it promise of possible Roman participation in the Faith and Order movement, permission was requested to publicize the letter. As a consequence not only was Cardinal Gaspari's original letter read to the Garden City Conference but also a portion of a later letter in which permission for publicity of the first letter was given.

At the time of the Garden City meeting the General Synod delegates apparently raised no objection to the trend of events. However, when they reported to the next Synod convention in June 1917 they were not only sharply critical of developments at the 1916 Conference but went on to recommend that relations with the Faith and Order movement be discontinued.

The commissioners began their report by calling attention to the vagueness and indefiniteness of the plans and purposes of the movement. Objection was voiced against the inclination to brand all schism as sin, reporting with approval a statement made at the Conference by a Presbyterian leader who had declared "Presbyterians have no apology to offer for the Reformation." No real promise for the future seemed to be present as long as the Episcopalians insisted on the fundamental nature of apostolic succession. Since Lutherans view the validity or invalidity of such succession as "a matter of supreme indifference" it was the judgment of the commissioners that "this church unity conference of Episcopal parentage and patronage" would be an unsafe guide and an unavailing force in the quest for Christian unity. While Dr. Remensnyder at the First Preliminary Conference in 1913 had suggested that Lutherans might be willing to compromise with those insisting on episcopacy this view was not shared by the commissioners as they reported to the 1917 convention. One cannot help but wonder how Dr. Remensnyder felt when the commission of which he was still a member insisted that no compromise was considered possible with the Episcopalian advocates of apostolic succession. With or without his approval the report declared that

> The Evangelical Lutheran Church ... must and will always insist that she is entitled to the name and prerogatives of a true Church of Christ, and that her ministry and sacraments are entitled to be regarded as genuine and valid. We are not ready to nullify and repudiate the Reformation and the fundamental principles upon which it is based. ...
>
> The pastor's calling is of God, through a congregation of God's people, and no human agency, no pope or bishop, has any authorization whatever to intrude himself between the congregation and the pastor whom it calls. For this reason the historical importance attached to a so-called apostolic succession theory of the ministry is to us as Lutherans not only unwise, but reprehensive and unauthorized by the Word of God. The Protestant world is done with man-made theories about the validity of ordination and can expect no objective unity of the Church along any such lines.[28]

The naive attitude of Faith and Order leaders toward the Roman Catholic Church discredited the whole movement in the eyes of the General Synod's commissioners. A large part of their report consisted of a critical evaluation of the Vatican correspondence which had been so prominently publicized at the Garden City Conference. Recalling how the papal communication had been received by some with something of childish delight and by others with feelings of surprise and consternation, the Lutheran delegates found it hard to understand how the letter, suave and diplomatic but above all "studiously dexterous in statement", could have raised any hope for Vatican cooperation. Cardinal Gaspari's letter, although "almost cordial in tone", rather than revealing a new spirit of friendliness, actually expressed sharp criticism of Protestantism.

> In this letter Protestantism is stigmatized as 'prejudiced opinions' from which to be 'freed'. It deals with old, vanquished papal assumptions and presumptions deftly insinuated, and the significance of the whole of it, boiled down, is just what the Protestant world has known ever since Luther's theses, to wit, that the pope will be happy to take back into the Roman Church the whole mass of Protestants any day they admit that the Reformation was wrong and that Romanism is the sole and only valid form of Christianity. This kind of church unity can be had without the bother and expense of holding a world conference.
>
> There is nothing even novel in the calm statement that the pope recognizes in himself 'the source and cause of the unity of the church'. It is but another expression of the age-long arrogancy of the papacy. The pope of Luther's day could have written such words just as unctuously.[29]

The optimistic view which the Episcopalian leaders of Faith and Order held toward the Vatican correspondence was due in part to their belief that the Anglican family of churches is ideally suited to be a bridge between Catholicism and Protestantism. With this "delusion" of the Episcopalians the General Synod commissioners took sharp issue.[30]

Attention was next directed to criticisms of Faith and Order which had appeared in publications of other churches.

It was noted that even in Episcopal quarters there was not a unanimous enthusiasm for the new movement. The Episcopal Recorder of Philadelphia, skeptical of any positive results, had called the movement "A great big nothing, leading nowhere save to further disagreement, and a final rebuff at the hands of the Roman Catholic Church.[31] The Chronicle, an organ of the low church party had published the following facetious evaluation:

> That dear old humbug, the World's Conference on Faith and Order, bobbed up again--made a report, to which nobody paid any attention, and was continued. The money Mr. Morgan gave them is fast being spent, which is all to the good. I suppose the commission will last as long as the cash holds out, and then Vale! Just as the war was starting a few of the members were going abroad to flirt with the pope and Greek dignitaries with unpronounceable names. The only good thing I can see that this war has accomplished was to keep these gentlemen at home.[32]

In The Baptist Watchman-Examiner objection had been voiced against Episcopalian insistence on apostolic succession and had warned that if the Episcopalians persisted in putting forward the High Church party as leaders in the Christian unity program all non-Episcopal churches might eventually suspect their sincerity and reject their leadership.[33]

The commissioners concluded their report with the recommendation that the General Synod "decline to look with further favor upon this movement in behalf of the organic Church unification of Christendom". Their recommendation was adapted and the commission discontinued, thus severing all relations with Faith and Order.

The 1917 action of the General Synod has been related in detail in order to point up the fact that the United Lutheran Church's participation in Faith and Order was not entered into automatically or as an easy sequence to earlier General Synod membership. It was only after long and careful deliberation that the ULCA in 1924 agreed to send delegates to the Stockholm and Lausanne Conferences.

As far as the Faith and Order movement was concerned the withdrawal of the General Synod was comparatively unimportant. No reference seems to have been made to it either at any of the subsequent Faith and Order meetings or in any of the published reports. Even without the action the relationship would have terminated the following year when the General Synod entered a three-way merger which formed the ULCA. There is no indication that merger negotiations in any way influenced the Synod's 1917 decision.

The action came more as a result of developments within the General Synod than it did because of any changing emphasis within Faith and Order. The strong stress upon the importance of order and the inclination to do everything possible to enlist the participation of Rome was present from the beginning. The papal correspondence widely publicized in 1916 only served to emphasize a tendency which had been present all the time. The reason why the General Synod earlier seemed to be enthusiastic about the new movement into which it had entered without any apparent objection or hesitation was that the earlier participation centered largely in one person, Dr. Remensnyder, whose views on apostolic succession and the anticipated inclusion of Rome in an eventual united church, have already been noted. His election to the presidency of the General Synod at the same convention which acted to accept the Faith and Order invitation as well as the fact that he was a pastor in New York City where meetings of the new movement were to be held made him the logical man to serve as chairman of the Synod's commission on Faith and Order. Even when he retired from his two year term as president he was continued on the commission by the 1913 and 1915 conventions. Until 1916 the other members of the commission appear to have been such in name only. Dr. Remensnyder alone attended all meetings of the new movement and prepared the reports presented to the conventions. Representing the more liberal wing of the General Synod which since the days of Dr. S. S. Schmucker had been inclined toward a free relationship with the various churches, his influence was on the wane. While he continued as pastor in New York both his general outlook and his advanced age kept him from assuming any influential role in the last few years of the General Synod or during the early years of the United Lutheran Church. He died in 1927.

Among the members of the commission which recommended withdrawal was Dr. F. H. Knubel who was to be an important figure in American and world Lutheranism from 1918 to 1944. He represented a more conservative confessionalism which had come to develop within the General Synod in recent decades. To what extent he participated in the Garden City Conference and in the formulation of the commission's subsequent report is not known. However, his first hand contact with that meeting and with the deliberations of the commission helped to prepare him for the role which was later to be his, not only in the Lutheran church, but in the molding of Lutheran attitudes toward ecumenical movements.

CHAPTER II

AMERICAN LUTHERANS ON THE ROAD TO THE WORLD COUNCIL, FROM GENEVA TO EDINBURGH, 1920-1937

A. American Lutherans participating in the World Conferences

In August 1920 leaders of the Life and Work and of the Faith and Order movements held preliminary conferences at Geneva, Switzerland. Among those present at the August 9-12 Life and Work meeting was Dr. J. A. Morehead, who was in charge of the National Lutheran Council's relief program in post-war Europe. It was in his capacity as relief administrator and not as a representative of the ULCA that he was in attendance. The question of possible participation in Life and Work deliberations had not as yet come before the ULCA for consideration. The American delegation to this Geneva meeting had been officially nominated by the Federal Council of Churches.[1] No American Lutheran leaders were in attendance at the August 12-20 Faith and Order conference.[2]

At the four great World Conferences which were held prior to the organization of the World Council of Churches the Lutheran churches of America were represented as follows: The Augustana Synod sent delegates to Stockholm, Oxford, and Edinburgh. The ULCA was officially represented at Stockholm, Lausanne, and Edinburgh. A pastor of the Lutheran Free Church participated in the Stockholm Conference, while at Lausanne men from the LFC and the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America were among the Conference members, although actually only as co-opted individuals recognized by the Conferences but not official delegates authorized and appointed by their churches.[3] Only the Augustana Synod and the ULCA participated officially in the Life and Work and the Faith and Order movements.

B. The Augustana Synod

Augustana did not agree to participate in Faith and Order deliberations until in 1936. As we have already noted a 1911 invitation to join in the movement was declined. A renewed invitation was brought before the 1920 convention but no action was taken other than resolving that the Synod "ought to become more familiar with the objectives of this movement, as well as to ascertain what position the Lutheran Church as a whole assumes in reference to this matter" before deciding what to do.[4] No further reference to the World Conference on Faith and Order appears in the Augustana Minutes until in 1936 when an invitation to be represented at Edinburgh was reported.[5] At that time it was voted that the matter be referred to the Synod's executive committee with full power to act.[6] Participation was approved and the following delegates sent to the 1937 Conference: Dr. Conrad Bergendoff, Pastor Clifford A.

Nelson and Dr. Alfred Bergin.[7] At the Conference Dr. Bergendoff was named to its Continuation Committee.[8]

Unofficially Augustana did have some contact with Faith and Order prior to 1937, its president, Dr. G. A. Brandelle, for a brief period being a co-opted member of the Conference. Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 68, in its membership list dated October 24, 1932, included the name of Dr. Brandelle. He was similarly listed in a March 1933 report.[9] In both instances it was specifically noted that he was a "co-opted" member.

While Augustana did not officially participate in the Faith and Order movement until just prior to the Edinburgh Conference, it was the first Lutheran body of America to accept the invitation to be represented at the 1925 Stockholm Conference on Life and Work. Its decision to be represented was not a very difficult one in view of the Synod's close relationship to the Lutheran Church of Sweden and in view of the visit to America in the fall of 1923 by Archbishop Soederblom, primate of the Church of Sweden and the moving spirit of the Life and Work movement. At its annual convention held at DeKalb, Illinois in June 1924 it was voted, apparently without any objection and without much discussion, that the Synod authorize the sending of delegates to the Stockholm Conference.[10] Its two delegates were to be President Brandelle and Dr. G. Rast.[11]

At the Conference one of the major addresses was given by Dr. Brandelle.[12] In his presentation on "Methods of Co-Operation and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions" he stressed the need for a solid foundation of faith as a necessary prerequisite for any successful Life and Work program. While it had been provided that matters of faith were to be strictly avoided at the Conference he insisted that considerations of Life and Work and of Faith and Order are so closely intertwined that they must be considered together. Declared Dr. Brandelle:

> It seems to me that unity of purpose and action will be difficult to arrive at, unless the outstanding lines, at least, of the divine plan of salvation be embodied in a few paragraphs and put on paper so that all may know whether we intend to go to heaven on our own plan or on that set forth by the Lord Jesus Himself.[13]

A realization of the fact that questions on Life and Work can not be separated from considerations of Faith and Order was to be one of the factors leading to a merging of the two movements to form the World Council of Churches.

In their report to the 1926 Synod convention the Augustana delegates to Stockholm presented an enthusiastic report, expressing full approval of the Conference and its achievements.[14] It was noted that while a Continuation Committee had been appointed no further meeting on a world scale was to be held for at least another ten years. It was evident that Augustana did not consider participation in the Stockholm

Conference as affiliation with Life and Work as a continuing movement. Following the report to the 1926 convention a full decade was to pass before any further attention was given to it. When the invitation to participate in the forthcoming Oxford Conference came before the 1936 convention it was referred to the Synod's executive committee with power to act.[15] Subsequently Dr. Conrad Bergendoff and Pastor Clifford A. Nelson were named to represent Augustana at Oxford.[16] With the ULCA's withdrawal from Life and Work, noted below, they were the only American Lutheran delegates at the Conference.

C. The United Lutheran Church

1. Preliminary deliberations and actions.

At the first convention of the United Lutheran Church in America, held in New York City in 1918, no official reference was made to the Faith and Order movement or to efforts which were already underway in behalf of Life and Work.[17] However, the question of ecumenical relationships was brought to the attention of the delegates. Dr. Henry Eyster Jacobs, for many years professor at the Philadelphia Seminary of the General Council and an outstanding American Lutheran historian, in a sermon at the opening service of the convention pointed to American Lutheranism's need for defining more adequately what its relationship to other churches shall be. He went on to urge that while Lutherans must be faithful to their Confessions kindly consideration must at the same time be given to those of other churches and this on the very basis of the Lutheran Confessions themselves.

> The student of the Book of Concord knows how, in its Preface, it discriminated between, on the one hand, entire Churches--which it emphatically disclaims as condemning--and overzealous partisans on the other, who misrepresent and rancorously attack what we hold to be nothing less than the truth of God's Word; and how it extends the hand of sympathy to the Reformed martyrs of the Netherlands and of France, and assures them that the Lutheran Churches are with them 'in the fellowship of suffering.'[18]

He warned the newly organized church against a rigid and narrow exclusivism which keeps Christians from learning from one another and from coordinating Christian forces for more effective service. At the same time he warned against an undiscriminating interchurch fellowship with all who may call themselves Christian as well as against "premature plans for union" which would tend to "paralyze the life of the Church" by their efforts to suppress denominational distinctions. Dr. Jacobs envisioned the possibility of having the Lutheran churches of America achieve a solution to the ecumenical problem in a way not yet realized in Europe.[19]

In the constitution adopted by the first convention of the ULCA it was provided that only the general body would have power of forming and dissolving relationship with interdenominational organizations.[20] This was done in order that there might be assured uniformity and consistency of practice as well as a more careful and thorough study of the matter than would be likely if left to Synods, boards and agencies.

During the first two years following the formation of the ULCA its Executive Board received numerous requests from various interchurch groups and general organizations seeking to establish official relations with the new church. Among such groups were the American Bible Society, the Lord's Day Alliance, the World Conference on Faith and Order, the Federal Council of Churches, the Interchurch World Movement, and the Interchurch Council on Organic Union. The Executive Board reported to the 1920 convention that it had commended the American Bible Society to the congregations of the church rather than to establish relations at the general body level. Tentative permission had been given to the Board of Home Missions, the Board of Foreign Missions, the Board of Education, the Sunday School Board and the Women's Missionary Society to associate themselves with parallel interdenominational councils, commissions and societies. The request for recognition by the Lord's Day Alliance had been denied in view of the legalistic methods and the general approach of that organization. Likewise participation in the Interchurch World Movement had been declined on constitutional and other grounds. The earlier actions by the Executive Board were approved by the convention.[21] Action was deferred on a proposal to accept membership in the Federal Council in order that further study might be given to the issues involved. It was agreed, however, to authorize the sending of visitors to the Council's Quadrennial meeting which was to be held in Boston later that year.[22]

During the 1918-1920 biennium little if any attention was given to overtures from the Faith and Order movement. No recommendation of any kind was brought before the 1920 convention relative to it. The lack of response by the Executive Board probably reflected a negative attitude toward the movement on the part of churchmen who as members of the General Council had some years earlier declined participation, or who as members of the General Synod had shared in the vote withdrawing that body from the movement in 1917.

2. The Washington Declaration

The most important action of the 1920 convention was the adoption of a "Declaration of Principles Concerning the Church and Its External Relationships" which has since come to be commonly known as the "Washington Declaration."[23] In it the ULCA defines what it considers to be the Lutheran idea of Christian unity and how such unity should express itself in keeping with the catholic spirit of the Lutheran Church. It is affirmed that the unity of the Church is not some distant goal toward which Christians strive but a present reality apprehended by faith. To it belong all true believers in Christ. The Church is one because Christ the head is one. It is holy, not because of any attained righteousness on the part of its members, but by virtue of the holiness given to it by Christ. It is catholic in that it includes all saints and true believers of all times and places. It is apostolic, not by virtue of any organizational connection with the apostles, but because it has and proclaims the same faith that was in the hearts and lives of the apostles. In the Scriptures we have a permanent and authoritative record of apostolic truth which is the ground of Christian faith.

While the "one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church" confessed in the Nicene Creed is a present spiritual reality apprehended by faith, Christians can not rest content to have these characteristics remain only a matter of spiritual consideration but will seek to give expression in their particular churches to the attributes of the one true Church. A church does this when it professes faith in Jesus Christ, when it faithfully preaches the Word and administers the sacraments, when it performs works of serving love, and when it attempts to secure universal acceptance of the truth it holds and confesses. In the last instance the aim is not an enlargement of external church organization through proselyting methods but rather a spreading of the truth of the Gospel by constantly bearing witness to it.

It is held to be quite proper that church organization should take on varying forms, as dictated by circumstances of time and place. Specific types of organization are merely a matter of expediency. No church can rightly claim that it is the one true Church, for the true Church is present wherever the Gospel is so preached and the sacraments so administered that men are won to faith in Christ.

That the churches differ in their understanding of the Gospel is a fact which must be frankly recognized and honestly faced. If a church is not to compromise its confession and witness it must define what its relationship shall be toward churches with doctrines at variance with its own. In defining such relationships the catholic spirit will find expression if a church fulfills its following responsibilities:

1. To declare unequivocally what it believes concerning Christ and His Gospel, and to endeavor to show that it has placed the true interpretation upon that Gospel, and to testify definitely and frankly against error.

2. To approach others without hostility, jealousy, suspicion or pride, in the sincere and humble desire to give and receive Christian service.

3. To grant cordial recognition to all agreements which are discovered between its own interpretation of the Gospel and that which others hold.

4. To cooperate with other Christians in works of serving love in so far as this can be done without surrender of its interpretation of the Gospel, without denial of conviction, and without suppression of its testimony as to what it holds to be the truth.[24]

The Declaration states the ULCA's willingness to enter into unlimited cooperation and even organic union with any and all Lutheran churches which subscribe the historic Lutheran Confessions.

With reference to possible unity with other Protestant churches it holds that the union of Christians into a single organization is far less important than agreement in the proclamation of the Gospel. While union of organization may indeed in given instances be expedient, agreement in testimony is a matter of principle. Any union with other Protestant churches must be based on positive agreement concerning the truth for which the united body shall stand. The first step then must be a frank, clear and full setting forth of each church's convictions of faith so that the nature and extent of agreement and of disagreement may be apparent. In all such deliberations it is a church's duty to set forth fully what it believes and why. The Washington Declaration asserts that until there is unity of confession with other churches the ULCA is conscience bound to continue its separate existence as a witness to the truth as understood and taught by that church.

While organic union with non-Lutheran churches is held to be impossible in view of doctrinal differences, the Declaration affirms the ULCA's desire and willingness, under stipulated conditions, to cooperate with other churches in works of serving love. Its attitude toward cooperative organizations and movements will in each instance be determined by a consideration of the purposes it seeks to accomplish, the principles on which it rests, and of the effect which participation will have on the independent position of the church as a witness to evangelical truth. Certain doctrines and principles are cited which shall serve as a minimal test by which to determine whether participation can be approved. Affiliation will be withheld where there is a denial of any of the stated affirmations. Cooperation will be possible only in organizations whose purposes lie within the proper sphere of church activity, namely, the preaching and teaching of the Word, the administering of the sacraments and works of Christian love. To use church organization as an agency for securing the enactment and enforcement of law, or for the application of external force is held to be foreign to the true purpose for which the churches exist. It is added that there are indeed organizations and movements for social and political reform, for the enforcement of law and order, for the settlement of industrial problems, for the improving of material environment, and the like, to which the church can properly commend its members but with which it as a church cannot see its way clear to affiliate.

The final section of the Washington Declaration, dealing with "Movements and Organizations Injurious to the Christian

Faith," lays down principles with reference to fraternal and semi-religious organizations whose teachings may be at variance with those of the church. The arguments are not of immediate concern to us in our present study.

The Washington Declaration, with its emphasis on the catholic spirit and its outlining of ways in which this spirit can be practically implemented in the life of the church, has contributed in a positive way to American Lutheran participation in ecumenical efforts. The principles and proposals represented a great step forward in American Lutheran deliberations on the question of interdenominational relations. Except for the General Synod pronouncements of the previous century, which were of little lasting importance because of their inclination to abandon the Lutheran confessional principle, most earlier theses and declarations by the various Lutheran churches of America had been negative in tone and prohibitive in effect. The 1920 statement, while grounding itself soundly on the historic Lutheran confessions, proceeded with positive emphasis to explore ways in which interdenominational cooperation could be practiced. While rigid requirements quite properly preclude the possibility of Lutheran churches entering into organic unity with other churches except on the basis of full agreement in doctrine, and while participation in merely cooperative organizations is subject to pointed limitations, the Washington

Declaration has provided a sound basis upon which the ULCA has moved on to active participation and leadership in ecumenical organizations. It has further helped to mold the attitude of world Lutheranism toward interchurch relations, a portion of it having subsequently been incorporated in the Lutheran World Convention's statement on "Lutherans and Ecumenical Movements." The principles enunciated deserve the careful attention of all churches as a realistic approach is made toward an effective consolidation of a divided Christendom, a Christendom which is more seriously divided than many enthusiasts for unity prefer to admit.

3. Invitations to participate in World Conferences accepted.

At the ULCA's third biennial convention, held in Buffalo, New York, October 17-25, 1922, considerable attention was devoted to the matter of ecumenical relations. Participation in parallel agencies or inter-board bodies by the Home and Foreign Mission Boards, the Board of Education, the Parish and Church School Board and the Women's Missionary Society was given final approval. By official action it was urged that ULCA personel participating in interchurch organizations should always press for a maintaining of "the representative principle."[25] This emphasis was stressed because of the growing inclination on the part of some cooperative organizations to add to the representatives of the churches an increasing number of individuals, under various designations, as members with varying powers. Objection to this practice of "co-opting" members was to be a pointed issue in the ULCA's future relation with Faith and Order and Life and Work.

After extended deliberation it was voted to decline membership in the Federal Council of Churches and to approve only a "consultative" relationship providing for limited participation and cooperation. Full membership was rejected on the ground that the Council failed to recognize the necessity or importance of unity in faith and its confession, because it was inclined to set up machinery seeking to have the world follow Christian principles even without being converted to such principles, and because of its failure to distinguish between legitimate areas of cooperation between churches with differing doctrinal positions and the activity of a united church. The Council's comprehensive program, embracing practically every activity of the church, seemed to suggest that its ultimate goal was to become a united church, and this without any evident concern for doctrinal considerations.[26]

The question of possible affiliation with the Life and Work and the Faith and Order movements also came before the 1922 convention for consideration. During the 1921-1922 biennium formal invitations had been received asking the ULCA to participate in the two projected World Conferences. Following receipt of the invitations, Dr. M. G. G. Scherer, secretary of the church, had been asked to make a detailed study of the two movements and prepare statements for consideration by the Executive Board. While this study was in process Dr. Knubel had received an urgent invitation from a Professor K. B. Westman of the University of Uppsala asking the ULCA president to attend a meeting of the Committee on Arrangements for the Conference on Life and Work which was to be held at Haelsingborg, Sweden in August 1922. Because an immediate reply had been required Dr. Knubel had written to Prof. Westman declining the invitation and explaining why the ULCA did not consider it possible to participate in the Life and Work movement. The results of Dr. Scherer's study as well as Dr. Knubel's letter touching both on Life and Work and Faith and Order were laid before the delegates to the 1922 ULCA convention.[27]

In his report on Faith and Order Dr. Scherer called attention to the fact that the movement had throughout been fostered and promoted by church authority and with proper regard for all church formalities. He noted the widespread endorsement coming from among all the great families of Trinitarian churches, with the exception of Rome. He saw in the movement a great opportunity for bearing testimony to evangelical truth and for cooperating with others in "the effort to reach a common understanding as to the nature and unity of the church." On the other hand, he could see no prospect for the achieving of a permanent and valid union of the churches. The very name, which placed questions of order on the same level of importance as those of faith, seemed itself to point to an insoluble impasse. Similarly it appeared unlikely that positive agreements concerning the truth for which the united church should stand could ever be reached.[28] In his survey of the Life and Work movement Dr. Scherer observed that many participants in the 1920 conference had been co-opted members rather than official representatives of churches.[29]

In Dr. Knubel's letter the ULCA's desire for a world conference of Lutherans was mentioned. By first having such a gathering Lutherans would be able to approach participation in ecumenical movements with a common understanding and as a consequence exert a greater influence on world Christianity. Lutherans of America would have much to learn from their European brethren while at the same time the European Lutherans would be better able to approach the ecumenical question on the basis of a fuller knowledge of American Protestantism and its interdenominational practices.[30]

Apprehension was expressed over the undue multiplication of interdenominational organizations and conferences since too many such conferences instead of adding to the church's effectiveness would actually result in distracting the churches from their central task, consuming their energy and dissipating their time and man-power. The danger seemed the more real because many of the interdenominational activities were aimed at little more than a display of unity without contributing in a positive way to the work which the churches have as their basic responsibility. Furthermore, doubt was expressed over what could possibly be accomplished in conferences of but brief duration.[31]

Dr. Knubel criticized the inclination in most interchurch movements to approach the idea of Christian unity too much from the top down without giving proper consideration to unity within congregations, local territories and individual denominations. He voiced objection against the growing practice of co-opting members for the various movements:

> In many movements we note a growing and dangerous disregard of the representative principle. We mean thereby that the membership in these movements, especially from America, is very frequently not at all representative of the Church Bodies themselves. In addition to regular representatives very often many additional members are named by the movements or organizations themselves, under the terms Co-opted, Corresponding, At Large, Advisory, Affiliated. The neglect of the representative principle constitutes in reality a despising of the Church.[32]

The most important reason cited for withholding participation was the inclination on the part of most interdenominational organizations to neglect or minimize considerations of faith and its confession. This he viewed to be especially true of American cooperative organizations such as the Federal

Council. He noted that in the forthcoming Life and Work Conference all reference to matters of faith was to be avoided. He expressed doubt that the frequently stated desire "to know the mind of Christ" for the purpose of dealing with practical problems could thus be satisfied since "any consideration of the mind of Christ must involve a consideration of those things which go to make up our Christian faith and its confession."[33]

The 1922 convention agreed with President Knubel and the Executive Board that the ULCA should decline the invitations to participate in the Life and Work and the Faith and Order movements.[34]

The matter, however, did not become a closed issue. The Executive Board continued to study the question of possible participation, keeping abreast of developments and carefully examining the literature being sent out by the two movements. The desired international conference of Lutherans was held at Eisenach in 1923 although discussions there seem to have effected no change in the ULCA's outlook on ecumenical relationships.

At the July 9-10, 1924 meeting of the Board, after a long discussion, it was agreed that under certain conditions the ULCA could approve participation in the Stockholm and the Lausanne Conferences. The officers were instructed to prepare a statement for proper action by the Board at its next meeting, so that recommendations might be ready for consideration by the church's fourth biennial convention which was to be held in Chicago later in the year. Such a statement was presented and approved by the Board on October 21st.[35]

The Bulletin of Reports, prepared in advance of the October 21-29 sessions, gave but little indication that the church's 1922 decision on Life and Work and Faith and Order might be reversed. Dr. Knubel, in his president's report, stated that no change had taken place in the ULCA's formal relationships with non-Lutheran churches. Noting the confused confessional situation existing among the other churches he stressed the importance of an unswerving allegiance to "Gospel principles." His closing observation on interchurch relations did hint at the possibility of participation in the World Conferences under certain conditions:

> Naturally it is always possible for us to enter into worth-while conferences with them, if only in such conferences there will be mutual and open recognition of confessional differences and if therefore such conferences will not be proclaimed as being in themselves manifestations of Christian unity.[36]

In a supplementary report the Executive Board brought before the convention the following recommendations:

> The literature on the World Conference on Faith and Order thus far issued, seems to us to give full assurance that it is to be a truly Free Conference. Upon this understanding the Executive Board is of the opinion that we can participate in the Conference provided:

> (1) That our representatives may and shall present in love, yet with all frankness, the view of the Lutheran Church on any and all points that may come under discussion, and specifically
>
> (2) That our represantatives may and shall submit for consideration, at the proper time, the whole or any part of the Doctrinal Basis of the United Lutheran Church in America, and also that there shall be accorded a courteous and respectful hearing to their presentation of the doctrines and principles set forth in the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. (See Declaration of Principles adopted at Washington, SectionC, IV.)
>
> (3) That our representatives shall not take any action involving inconsistency either with our Doctrinal Basis or with any covenanted obligations of the United Lutheran Church to other Lutheran bodies in this country or throughout the world. ...
>
> We recommend that if the Convention approved this judgment of the Executive Board and desires representation, it instruct the Executive Board to provide for such representation in this Conference.[37]

After reviewing developments within the Life and Work movement it was recommended that participation in the Stockholm Conference be made contingent upon a definite statement by its International Committee giving assurance that the gathering would be a conference only without involving the participating churches in any commitment to an organization nor to any actions there taken. A statement to that effect had already been published by the American Committee for Life and Work, whose leaders had subsequently been informed by ULCA representatives that similar assurance would also have to be issued by the International Committee as a prior condition for that church's participation. This stipulation was considered necessary especially in view of the Conference's division into geographical rather than confessional groupings and the provision that all reference to doctrine or doctrinal differences be omitted. The desired statement would in effect constitute official assurance, at top level, that there would be no effort made to gloss over the fact that there are confessional differences or to proclaim the Conference as a manifestation of Christian unity.[38]

The convention voted approval of the recommendations which had been made and referred the matter of participation in the Conferences back to the Executive Board with power to act.[39]

Not long after the close of the 1924 convention word was received that the International Committee on Arrangements for the Stockholm Conference had officially adopted the following statement:

> It is clearly understood that the Conference will not in any way affect denominational autonomy, whether in organization, doctrine or administration. No ecclesiastical body will be compromised in its distinctive position by participating in the conference. It is to be a free conference for mutual benefit, a conference only with no authority to bind any of its constituent bodies.[40]

With this definite assurance at hand the Executive Board arranged for ULCA participation in the Conference by the appointment of the following delegates: Drs. M. G. G. Scherer, E. P. Pfatteicher, J. A. Clutz, and Mr. J. B. Franke.[41]

4. The Stockholm Conference.

Dr. Clutz was scheduled to address the Conference on "The Church and International Relations," but an accident requiring hospitalization made it impossible for him to fulfill his assignment. After having seemingly recovered from his injuries received when hit by a truck on one of the Stockholm streets, he died suddenly of a heart attack just as he was about to start back to the United States.[42] Another of the ULCA delegates, Dr. E. P. Pfatteicher, was chosen by the Conference to serve as a member of the Life and Work Continuation Committee.[43]

An extended report on proceedings was presented at the 1926 ULCA convention. Disappointment was voiced over the Conference's failure to give any clear statement on the great social, industrial and international problems of the day. While a "Message to the Churches" had been issued it was hesitant and non-committal, its weakness being especially noticeable because of the extensive preliminary studies and the more definite recommendations which had been made by the various study commissions. It was quite evident that earlier optimistic expectations that it would be an easy matter to unite the churches "in the application of Christian ethics and the spirit of Christ to the problems of the present day" had not been realized. It was the judgment of the ULCA delegates to Stockholm, however, that failure at this point could actually represent a positive contribution to future ecumenical efforts. This might be so if only those earlier wearied with attempts to secure unity in faith were led to realize that where differences exist, whether in doctrine or over proposed solutions to social problems, it is not easy to reach agreement, and that "convictions are too deep to be dealt with by the erasure method, too stubborn to yield to mere resolution." Gratification was expressed over the emphasis placed on the teaching function of the church and the recognition that the church's primary task, even with reference to moral and social reform, lies not first of all in the teaching of high ideals but in seeking the conversion of sinners. Looking upon the Conference as having been of value in that it had brought together Christians of varied backgrounds and convictions to associate in friendly discussion and fellowship, the delegates closed their report with the recommendation that the question of future participation in Life and Work be left to the judgment of the church's Executive Board. The report and its recommendation were adopted.[44]

5. The Lausanne Conference.

From 1925 on the ULCA participated actively in Faith and Order deliberations. On the basis of conditions approved by the church's 1924 convention the Executive Board in February 1925 voted that delegates should be sent to the forthcoming

World Conference to be held in Lausanne two years later. In May 1925 a five man "Commission on the World Conference on Faith and Order" was appointed. Its members were to consist of Drs. F. H. Knubel, C. M. Jacobs, Holmes Dysinger, A. G. Voigt, and M. G. G. Scherer.[45] At a meeting of the commission in April 1926 two issues came up for special consideration. The first had to do with the "Draft Agenda" which had been prepared for use at the forthcoming Lausanne Conference, the other with the policy of co-opting interested individuals as members of the Conference. A resolution touching on the latter point was drawn up and subsequently approved by the church's Executive Board. In it was included the recommendation

> That the Business Committee of the Conference be notified that we question the propriety and wisdom of selecting and appointing co-opted individuals, who do not represent any church group or body, as members of the World Conference.[46]

At their meeting a month later the commissioners prepared a detailed criticism of the Draft Agenda together with suggested revisions. Their main objection was directed against the point of view from which the question of church union was being approached including the undue emphasis on episcopacy.[47] The commissioner's criticism and proposals were forwarded to the secretary of the World Conference and were subsequently considered by the Faith and Order Continuation Committee. Minutes of the Committee's August 23-25, 1926 meeting held in Berne, Switzerland included the following report:

> With regard to the alterations suggested by the commission of The United Lutheran Church in America, the Corresponding Secretary was authorized to say that an opportunity would be available at Lausanne for presentation of the said material.[48]

While the Continuation Committee on the second day of its meeting was thus at first inclined to uphold the Draft Agenda in its original form, the issue raised by the ULCA was far from being settled. Although Minutes of the Berne meeting make specific reference only to the proposed alterations suggested by the ULCA, evidently others had also raised objection to the Agenda as drawn up by the Subjects Committee. Before the meeting was over the matter again came up for consideration with the result that the previous inclination to retain the Agenda was reversed. Upon recommendation by Dr. Francis J. Hall and with the support of Bishop Charles Brent, Bishop C. A. Hall, and Mr. George Zabriskie a motion prevailed that the Agenda be declared obsolete.[49]

The policy of co-opting members, against which the ULCA had also voiced objection, was to be continued for another decade.[50]

At the Lausanne Conference, held August 3-21, 1927, the ULCA was officially represented by Drs. M. G. G. Scherer, Holmes Dysinger, W. H. Greever, and A. Steimle. One of the major addresses, "The Ministry of the Church," was given by

Dr. Scherer,[51] who was later also named to the Continuation Committee and its Business Committee.[52]

During the course of the Conference a supply of five hundred copies of the Augsburg Confession, the Schmalkald Articles and Luther's Small Catechism was distributed by the ULCA delegation.[53] On the very first day of the Conference they invited all Lutheran delegates to a dinner meeting in one of the hotels. Fifty-three delegates representing Lutheran churches of twelve countries responded.[54] This early meeting helped to establish among the Lutheran representatives from the various countries a spirit of cordiality and friendship which was to contribute to the development of a common point of view in regard to deliberations of the Conference and to prepare the way for the "Lutheran Declaration" which was later presented.

As the Conference progressed the ULCA delegates felt there was urgent need for a clear understanding as to the meaning and significance of any vote that might be taken on the findings of the Conference. This seemed especially imperative as tendencies showed themselves in commission and group meetings for ambiguous formulations which could be interpreted in several ways. In an effort to avert anticipated unfavorable developments, the ULCA delegation dispatched a letter to Bishop Brent, president of the 1927 Assembly, in which misgivings were outlined and suggestions made. The main suggestion was that the Conference should not "adopt" any formulations as representing agreements reached, but that it should merely "receive" the findings of the commissions for transmission to the churches of the world.[55] Dr. Scherer received a gracious and sympathetic reply from Bishop Brent but it was not until later, after presentation of the Lutheran Declaration, that the suggestion to "receive" rather than to "adopt" reports was made the policy of the Conference.

The matter at issue came in for extended discussion at a meeting of all Lutheran delegates called by Archbishop Soederblom. A committee was appointed to draw up a statement setting forth the position of the Lutheran delegates as to the manner in which Conference reports should be transmitted to the churches. Two ULCA delegates, Dr. Scherer and Dr. Steimle, were put on the eight-man committee which on Monday evening, August 15th, handed to Bishop Brent a copy of the "Lutheran Declaration."[56]

The Declaration, which was read to the whole Conference a few days later, expressed doubt that a gathering such as that assembled at Lausanne could possibly adopt propositions which would be expressive of unity in its true sense. It urged that no final vote should be taken on any of the formulations that might be drawn up, but that these should simply be added to the proclamation as material for further consideration by the churches. It suggested the formation of a study commission in each church as well as a joint commission consisting of trusted representatives of each of the denominations. After a careful study of the findings the results could be reported to a future Conference.[57]

Following the reading of the Lutheran Declaration Bishop Brent stated that he, together with Dr. Francis Hall, Bishop E. J. Palmer and the Lutheran delegates presenting the statement, had prepared a preliminary draft of a preamble for the commission reports in which the policy of "receiving" rather than "adopting" the reports was set forth. This preamble, in slightly amended form, was later approved by the Conference.[58]

6. Faith and Order deliberations from Lausanne to Edinburgh.

Upon their return to America the ULCA delegates, deeply mindful of the fact that they had been at Lausanne not as individual Christians but as representatives of their church, presented a thorough report on all proceedings.[59] In keeping with suggestions in the Lutheran Declaration they recommended that the ULCA Executive Board appoint a commission to study the Lausanne reports as well as other materials which might later be transmitted from the Faith and Order Continuation Committee. Such a commission was subsequently appointed consisting of the four delegates, Drs. Scherer, Steimle, Greever and Dysinger, plus three additional members, Drs. J. A. W. Haas, Charles M. Jacobs and John Aberly.[60]

At the 1928 ULCA convention a comprehensive report was made on the World Conference on Faith and Order, both by the delegates and the special commission. Members of the commission were unanimously agreed that there was nothing in the Lausanne report which would preclude further participation in the movement. They went on to point out, however, that the reports could not be looked upon as a possible basis for a union of the churches inasmuch as they were not in proper form to serve as a basis of doctrinal agreement, because they were inadequate as to definition, and because certain subjects considered by Lutherans to be essential to a right conception of Christian truth were either not stated at all or in such terms as to leave the meaning of the statements unclear.[61]

The 1928 convention agreed that a study commission should be continued for a further examination of the Faith and Order reports. Again a resolution was adopted urging a greater respect for the ecclesiastical and representative principle:

> We believe that ecclesiastical order as well as a hopeful procedure will require that the Conference should be a Conference of the Churches, truly representative in character, but with limited powers.[62]

At the 1930 convention an even more extensive study of the Lausanne deliberations was presented.[63] Each of the sections of the reports was given detailed attention. Points with which Lutherans agreed, as well as points of disagreement, were listed. Recommendations for a better statement of the issued were suggested. The commissioners' careful study was approved by the convention and, as an official statement of the ULCA's reaction to the Lausanne Conference, was forwarded to the newly established Theological Committee of the World Conference. The report was subsequently included in the book, Convictions, published in 1934 by authorization of the Continuation Committee.[64]

One of the main criticisms registered by the ULCA commission was directed against the ambiguous language used in some of the Lausanne statements which frequently allowed divergent and even contradictory interpretations on important questions of faith.[65] Objection was also voiced against the easy tendency to blame all weakness of the church upon its divided state. Declared the commissioners:

> We believe also that much damage is done to the cause of Christian unity by that undiscerning spirit which sees in the present divided condition of the Church the one cause of the slow coming of the Kingdom of God on earth. There are other causes which are,

> perhaps, more potent and which would work with little less power, if not with more, against a monstrous ecclesiastical organization seething with internal divisions.[66]

The 1930 convention repeated the instruction which had been given to the commission two years earlier, that it keep in touch with other Lutherans so that a common approach to the Faith and Order movement might be sustained and that Lutheran unity might be furthered.[67]

Highly disturbing to the 1932 convention was the news of recent action by the Continuation Committee in which tentative approval had been given for the co-opting of a considerable number of members for the Second World Conference on Faith and Order. It was being planned to include in the membership of the Second Conference all members of the Continuation Committee, whether or not these be named by their churches as delegates, a youth group of about fifty, as well as interested individuals from churches not officially participating. It was argued that this should be done "in order to make the Conference as representative as possible."[68]

The ULCA commissioners took sharp issue with the suggestion that co-opting members would make the Conference more representative.

> The natural question is, "representative" of what? We believe that the Continuation Committee should come to a definite decision as to whether or not this Conference is to be a Conference of the Churches. We cannot

> believe that individuals, with no actual constituency behind them and representing therefore only their own views or the views of groups, should have even a voice in a Conference of responsible representatives of Churches. We believe that any hope of true accomplishment by this Conference is futile unless it truly represents the Churches.[69]

Delegates to the convention endorsed the position of the commission by adopting a resolution providing

> That the United Lutheran Church in America record its conviction that the next Conference should be composed as completely as possible of representatives officially appointed by the Churches.[70]

No action was taken on the formal invitation asking that delegates to the proposed Second World Conference be appointed. Whether or not the ULCA would be represented in 1937 would depend largely on developments within the Faith and Order movement in regard to policies it would pursue.

Among the developments reported two years later was the formation of a Regional Committee for the United States and Canada which was comprised of those officially selected by the churches as delegates to the 1937 Conference and by commissioners who were official representatives of their churches in those instances where the appointment of delegates had not yet been made. Assurance was given that other plans being proposed for some change of policy and procedure in the movement which would allow closer cooperation and the launching of practical programs of activity would first have to be approved by the churches before they could be adopted. Meanwhile, the original conditions which stipulated that the Conference on Faith and Order was solely for the purpose of study and discussion, without power to legislate or adopt resolutions, would continue to be in effect. Proposals looking to a possible merger of various ecumenical organizations were also reviewed.[71]

By the time of the 1936 ULCA convention, held October 14-21, plans for the Second World Conference were nearing their final stage. Recent developments within the Faith and Order movement had been such that the ULCA was now ready to be represented at the Edinburgh Conference. In May 1936 the Faith and Order Executive Committee had agreed that the World Conference itself should not be responsible for any communion services but that arrangements for such services should be made by participating churches who might invite others than their own members if they so desired. This provision was in keeping with the Lutheran emphasis that agreement in faith concerning the meaning of the Lord's Supper is a prerequisite for common participation. It also avoided problems raised by the insistence of some churches that the sacrament could be validly administered only by episcopally-ordained churchmen. While there was pressure for the holding of a joint communion service "as a demonstration of unity" and a unifying experience, the Executive Committee decided that the very nature of the Faith and Order movement required a respecting of the views of the various churches.[72]

In August 1936 the Continuation Committee had voted that only official delegates appointed by the churches themselves should be full members of the Conference.[73] This represented a triumph of a basic principle for which the ULCA had long contended. Fearing that the principle would still be compromised by granting representatives of the Youth Group a voice, even though without vote, the 1936 ULCA convention adopted the following resolution:

> That the Executive Board express to the Secretariat of the Continuation Committee our conviction that the character of the Conference as a gathering of official representatives of the church must be preserved for the sake of the movement itself, and that therefore we deem it unwise to give representatives of the Youth Group a voice in the Conference. As members of Christian Churches they are represented in the Conference through the delegates of their Churches.[74]

The Executive Board was instructed to select delegates to the Edinburgh Conference without delay so that they might make thorough preparation for an intelligent participation in the deliberations.

7. Withdrawal of delegates to the Oxford Conference

Even though the ULCA had been represented at Stockholm it did not consider itself to have any standing relationship to the Life and Work movement. While one of its delegates, Dr. Pfatteicher, had been named to the Continuation Committee there is no record that he attended any of its meetings or participated in any of its deliberations. Following the 1926 report of the delegates to Stockholm no further attention was given to Life and Work for nearly a decade. In response to an April 12, 1934 invitation from the American Section of the movement Dr. Steimle and Dr. Greever, both members of the church's Executive Board and of its Faith and Order commission, were asked by the Board to attend some of the Life and Work meetings. After having attended a few such meetings they recommended to the 1934 convention that the church's relations to the movement be limited to informal contacts, at least for the time being.[75]

As the time for the Oxford Conference drew closer further consideration was given to the possibility of sending delegates. The fact that Lutheran delegates from many lands would be in attendance and also in view of the role played by the ULCA delegates at Lausanne in behalf of a common Lutheran approach to ecumenical questions it was increasingly felt that the church should be represented at Oxford. Since the program was to center on the subject of Church and State it was thought to be especially important that American Lutherans be at the Conference so that the Lutheran witness might include that of a church "which has developed in life and confession untrammeled by any liaison with the State."[76]

It was voted by the 1936 convention that the delegates chosen to represent the ULCA at Edinburgh should also serve as delegates to the Oxford Conference. Even as the Stockholm Conference had been looked upon as a "free conference" only, so now the delegates to the 1937 Life and Work gathering were authorized to go to Oxford with the distinct understanding that the church was not thereby committing itself "to a definite participation in the movement" and that future relations with Life and Work would be decided after the report of the delegates.[77]

Such a report was never to come. For less than three months later the church's Executive Board voted to withhold representation. The action was taken when it became evident that a large proportion of the membership of the Conference would consist of co-opted individuals who were not official delegates appointed by the churches. It was but a brief yet a pointed report which was made on the matter at the church's 1938 convention:

> On January 14, 1937, the following recommendation, from the report of the Officers, with reference to the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work was approved:
>
> 'It is recommended that the U.L.C.A. be not represented at the meeting of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, the chief reason being that the membership of the Conference includes a large proportion of co-opted individuals. The Conference thus ceases to be effectively a Conference of the Churches.'

This Conference was held in Oxford, England, August, 1937.[78]

Not all within the ULCA were agreed that the action of the Executive Board had been the right one. Dr. Gould Wickey, Executive Secretary of its Board of Education, who had attended the Conference as an observer was highly critical of what had happened. In his judgment there had been nothing in the spirit, method or results of the Conference that justified his church's refusal to participate. The ULCA, with its needed witness on the Scriptures, freedom of conscience, civil and religious freedom, non-legalistic social reform and education, had been missed at Oxford. Warning that Lutherans must not be ashamed to be Protestants he urged that "if there is a reason, justifiable before God, for the existence of our church today, that same reason should compel us to bear witness anywhere and everywhere."[79]

The ULCA delegates to Edinburgh, who would also have represented their church at Oxford had not the Executive Board voted to withhold representation, agreed that the ULCA had been missed at Oxford. But they did not agree that the Board's decision had been a mistake. Their report on the Edinburgh Conference presented by Dr. Wentz included the following evaluation:

> It seems very clear that the action of your Board in declining to send delegates to the Oxford Conference

> on Life and Work had a most salutary effect in making Oxford and particularly Edinburgh, Church-conscious. When, therefore, the Edinburgh Conference considered the proposal of a merger between Faith-and-Order and Life-and-Work, special pains were taken to guard the ecclesiastical character of the proposed new organization, which is to be called the World Council of Churches.[80]

The primary issue at stake in the decision to withhold representation to the Oxford Conference was not whether the ULCA would be witnessing or failing to witness on the pressing social problems of the day, but whether a basic part of a church's witness is not loyalty to principles considered to be of fundamental importance. For fifteen years it had been pressing for recognition of the representative principle. In October 1936 it had been instrumental in securing recognition of the principle by the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention. At the very time that the withdrawal action was under consideration final details were being worked out for the publication of the LWC statement. If the statement was to be meaningful at all, the church most responsible for its being drawn up would certainly have to act in accordance with the principles there set forth.

The church's responsibility went even farther. It was generally known that one of the most important considerations to come before the 1937 conferences was the proposal that a comprehensive world council of churches be formed. The very future of effective ecumenical organization was involved.

The Faith and Order Continuation Committee had only a few months earlier taken definite action in support of the representative principle. When the ULCA in October 1936 agreed to send delegates to Oxford it was with the hope that Life and Work leaders, many of whom were also active in Faith and Order, would take a similar stand. When it became evident that Life and Work would continue to insist on co-option as a necessary procedure the ULCA had to decide in which direction its primary responsibility lay.

Failure to participate in the Conference would not necessarily mean the withholding of the church's witness on the issues there to be discussed. In fact, a church's responsibility for addressing itself to social problems is not fulfilled first of all by participation in meetings and conferences at high levels, impressive and helpful as these may be. Such problems are not solved by resolutions or statements. Their solution lies at a much deeper and more difficult level, requiring the conversion of individuals and their instruction in Christian principles so that as citizens and members of community, local or world-wide, they may apply these principles in every given situation. A world conference contributes only in a secondary way, and that primarily as it helps in the accomplishing of the churches' task at its basic level.

The value of joint deliberation and of a united witness, however, could not be overlooked nor minimized. Ecumenical organizations are important for the very reason that Christians with varying doctrinal views and from different parts of the world are more likely to give consideration to all sides of any question than is done in the deliberations of groups committed to a certain point of view, whether doctrinal or cultural.

The decision not to send delegates to Oxford proved to be a wise one. While the outcome of the Conference would likely have been little different had it been decided to send delegates, we shall see that deliberations on the formation of the World Council of Churches were influenced by the ULCA's stubborn adherence to a principle which at Edinburgh received general recognition.

8. The Edinburgh Conference

At the January 14, 1937 meeting of the Executive Board four delegates were appointed to represent the ULCA at the Edinburgh Conference.[81] They were Drs. E. E. Flack, W. H. Greever, A. Steimle and A. R. Wentz, all members of their church's Commission on Faith and Order. At the last minute Dr. Greever was unable to go.[82]

When proposals for the formation of a World Council of Churches were brought before the Conference Dr. Steimle and

Dr. Wentz were named to the special Committee of Sixty[83] to which the report of the Committee of Thirty-Five[84] was referred. Dr. Wentz served as secretary of the special committee as well as of its seven-man drafting committee which drew up the recommendations, which when adopted by the Conference authorized the formation of the World Council.[85]

The reason for the appointment of the Committee of Sixty was the mounting opposition to the proposals of the Committee of Thirty-Five. Although no significant objection had been voiced at the Oxford Conference, which readily approved the recommendations for a World Council, there was growing alarm over the proposal's failure to safeguard the principle of official church representation. In order that the delegates at Edinburgh might not become involved in a controversy on the floor of the Conference, the special committee, composed mainly of those who were critical of the plan as submitted, was appointed. It was by this special committee that the issues were debated and resolved. When its recommendations were brought to the floor of the Conference they were almost unanimously approved by the delegates, there being but one negative vote.[86] The provision that was primarily responsible for the favorable action was the stipulation that "The World Council shall consist of official representatives of the churches participating."[87] The importance of this recommendation by the Committee of Sixty has been evaluated as follows by one of its members, Dr. Floyd Tomkins:

> Without doubt, the chief factor in winning support from those who were questioning the original proposal was this stipulation that only the Churches themselves could appoint delegates.[88]

While it may not be possible fully to establish who was primarily responsible for the reaffirmation of the representative principle by the Faith and Order movement in 1936 and at the Second World Conference in 1937, there can be no doubt that one of the main champions of this principle from 1922 on had been the United Lutheran Church in America. In 1922, 1926, 1928, 1932, and again in 1936 official action had been taken urging the practical recognition of the principle. Also, in 1936 ULCA leaders were responsible for the Lutheran World Convention's statement on "Lutherans and Ecumenical Movements" in which the provision was included:

> That participation of Lutheran Churches in co-operative movements or general organizations among the Protestant Churches of the world, can be effected only when ... the co-operative movement or general organization in all of its assemblies, conferences, and parts, is constituted of official representatives of Church Bodies.[89]

Even though the representative principle had been reaffirmed by the Faith and Order Continuation Committee in 1936 it failed to receive general recognition by some of the most prominent leaders of the movement. It apparently had no spokesmen among the members of the Committee of Thirty-Five which included such men as Archbishop Temple and Canon Leonard Hodgson, president and general secretary of the World Conference, Dr. Yngve Brilioth, Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, Dr. Lewis Mudge, Canon Tissington Tatlow, and Dr. Visser 't Hooft. Also, it failed to receive recognition in the deliberations of the Oxford Conference when proposals for the formation of a World Council of Churches came up for consideration. No objection was voiced at that time for the proposals' failure to provide that the World Council should consist only of official representatives appointed by the churches.[90] Archbishop Temple did stress the desirability of having the whole ecumenical movement based more directly on the churches,[91] but that there was a lack of clarity or consistency in the thinking of the members of the Committee of Thirty-Five is evidenced in its proposal that the American members of the "Central Council" of the new world organization should be appointed through channels of the Federal Council.[92]

While a number of delegates to the 1937 Faith and Order Conference were openly critical of the above committee's proposals by the time that the Edinburgh Conference opened, evidently these same men in their capacity as delegates to the earlier Oxford Conference had failed to register any protest over a lack of provision for the representative principle. Dr. Tomkins observes that "It is surprising that this position had no spokesman in the Committee of 35 which drafted the World Council proposal. I have never heard any explanation."[93]

The ULCA was one of the few churches participating in the Edinburgh Conference that were not also represented at Oxford. Its delegates attended some of the earlier sessions, but only as visitors. Whether or not they had anything to do with the mounting opposition to the proposals for a World Council as originally submitted, the position of the ULCA on this issue was well known to Faith and Order leaders. Its disproportionate representation on the Committee of Sixty seems to have been a tacit recognition of that church's long and persistent efforts in behalf of the representative principle. While there were 344 delegates representing 123 church bodies two ULCA men were named to the committee.[94]

Dr. Wentz's role as secretary of the Committee of Sixty and of its seven-man drafting committee suggests the possibility that it was he who brought forward the crucial recommendation that "The World Council shall consist of official representatives of the churches participating." The very wording of the recommendation resembles the similar provision in the 1936 statement on "Lutherans and Ecumenical Movements" which was drawn up by Dr. Wentz.[95] Observes Dr. Tomkins, in reply to some questions with reference to the role of the ULCA in the triumph of the representative principle:

I doubt if anyone can tell you who in the drafting committee proposed this stipulation. Possibly Dr. Wentz could do so, since he was present as secretary of the drafting committee. He may have done so himself, but there were others (such as Dr. J. Ross Stevenson) equally concerned for this important principle.

The question had been debated for several years previous with regard to membership in the 1937 Edinburgh Conference, and many people had become convinced of the importance of this principle, which was indeed implicit in the original Faith and Order invitation of 1910. The United Lutheran Church, by its formal resolutions and by its delegates at meetings of the F. & O. Continuation Committee, was pressing this point. ...

What I have said above in no way detracts from the importance of Dr. Wentz's personal part in bringing about this result. He deserves credit, not just for proposing a particular sentence in a drafting committee report, but for many years of earnest and persuasive advocacy of this plan. Dr. Knubel was a strong advocate, too, as I know from many conversations on the subject in which we were in entire agreement; but he always depended on Dr. Wentz as spokesman at Faith and Order meetings. Whether he or someone else was behind the successive resolutions of the U.L.C. Executive Board I do not know. But certainly we owe it to the U.L.C. leadership that this fundamental principle was recognized and re-stated by Faith and Order; and so, in 1937, there were many who saw eye to eye with them as regards the World Council proposal.[96]

CHAPTER III

A COMMON APPROACH TO PARTICIPATION IN ECUMENICAL MOVEMENTS BY THE LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF THE WORLD

A. Factors Contributing to the Emergence of the Lutheran World Convention

As early as 1922 Dr. Knubel stressed the desirability of having the Lutheran churches of the world achieve some common understanding in regard to participation in interdenominational movements of an international character.[1] Two factors, especially, contributed to the emergence of a Lutheran world confessional organization. One was the heightened Lutheran consciousness developed as plans were laid for observing the 400th anniversary of the Reformation. The second was the extensive relief program carried on in war devasted Europe by the Lutheran churches of America.

The first factor was of importance particularly in America. The various Lutheran bodies were brought into closer relationship with one another as joint plans were considered for a fitting celebration of the Quadricentennial of the Reformation. Successful unity efforts were initiated which in 1917 and 1918 eventuated in the formation of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America and of the ULCA. The friendly spirit cultivated as leaders of the churches planned together also prepared the way for the emergence of cooperative organizations to deal with the special needs growing out of the war. On October 19, 1917 thirteen Lutheran bodies joined in organizing the National Lutheran Commission for Soldiers' and Sailors' Welfare of which Dr. F. H. Knubel was elected president. Lutheran service centers were set up, staffed and supported not only in this country but also in France. The Commission served as the authorized agency for the selection and approval of Lutheran Army and Navy chaplains. A helping hand was extended to the Lutheran Church in France which was experiencing great difficulty as a result of the war. When the war ended there was need for ministering to men still in the armed services. In addition a ministry to industrial workers in this country was launched. The Commission continued until May 1922 when it was dissolved. By that time its work among the service men had been completed and its other responsibilities taken over by the National Lutheran Council.[2]

The National Lutheran Council, organized September 6, 1918, was formed largely as "an after-war emergency organization dealing with problems arising from the abnormal conditions created by the war.[3] While the Commission had been formed to deal especially with a ministry to war-time needs, the Council directed its attention to a continuing ministry following the cessation of hostilities. On December 11, 1918 the Council voted to send a five-man commission to Europe to visit the Lutheran churches, to study conditions and investigate needs. The commission, which arrived in Europe early in 1919, was headed by Dr. John A. Morehead who was to direct relief activities and was largely responsible for the calling of the Eisenach meeting of Lutheran representatives which organized the Lutheran World Convention. At the 1923 meeting he was named chairman of the LWC Executive Committee and from 1929 to 1935 he served as full time LWC president.[4] The relief program became more extensive in scope than was originally anticipated. The initial aim of ministering to the spiritual needs of the Lutherans in Europe was immediately seen to be insufficient.[5] A survey of conditions revealed the urgent need for immediate physical assistance. Lutherans in America responded generously and without delay. From February 1919 to August 1925 over six and a half million dollars were collected and distributed by the Relief and Reconstruction Department of the NLC. In addition its World Service Program provided invaluable assistance to Lutheran mission fields which had been left stranded as a result of the war.[6]

One of the results of the relief program was the "discovery" by the Lutheran churches of Europe of "their hitherto little-known, and often little cared for, offspring in the so-called American 'Diaspora'"[7] The bond of fellowship continued to grow and soon leaders in Europe as well as in America saw the value of having a world confessional organization which would enable the churches to cooperate in the tremendous tasks which faced Lutheranism on a world scale. Thus when the NLC proposed a world meeting of Lutherans the suggestion was enthusiastically supported in Europe also. As a result of plans worked out by the NLC in cooperation with the Allgemeine Ev. Lutherische Konferenz and the Lutherische Bund, 147 delegates from twenty-two nations in Europe, Africa and America gathered at Eisenach August 19-24, 1923 and the Lutheran World Convention was organized.[8]

B. Ecumenical Views of the 1923, 1929 and 1935 Conventions

While much was said at Eisenach about the "ecumenical" character of Lutheranism, the emphasis was more on the universal validity of the Gospel message as believed and taught in the Lutheran Church than it was upon any consideration of possible participation in cooperative Christian movements of an interdenominational nature. It was this approach which was stressed in Bishop Ihmels' address on "The Ecumenical Character of the Lutheran Church" and in Dr. Knubel's address on "'That They May All Be One'--What Can The Lutheran Church Contribute To This End."[9]

At the Copenhagen meeting of the LWC held in 1929 a like emphasis stood out in deliberations on the ecumenical question. Bishop Samuel Stadener of Sweden, speaking on "What Does Lutheranism Offer As Its Distinctive Gift To Christendom?" stressed the soundness of the Lutheran heritage and message and cited specific "treasures" which Lutheranism had to offer.[10] Very similar was the approach of Dr. C. C. Hein of America in his address on "The Distinctive Contribution of Lutheranism to Christendom".[11] Neither speaker made any reference to possible participation in interdenominational organizations or movements. Nor was it included in the discussion following their addresses.[12]

Participation in the Stockholm Conference was reflected in the treatment accorded to the subject of the Church's responsibility in the field of social action, with a brief reference made to the 1925 deliberations. Three addresses were given touching on the subject. Dr. G. M. Bruce in his presentation on "The Lutheran Conception of the Relation Between Christianity and the World," emphasized that

> It is also the function of the Church to teach and train the believer as to his attitude, conduct, and activity in every phase of individual and social endeavor and assist and support him in promoting the good and resisting and destroying the evil in society. ...
>
> It is the function of the Church by precept and example to hold aloft the individual and social ideals of Christianity and to testify with conviction, authority, and courage against prevailing social sins and

> evils in whatever sphere, economic, political, cultural, and moral, creating a social consciousness, conscience, and will, and the resultant public opinion which will make for high and noble social ideals, justice, righteousness, stability, peace, well-being and the pursuit of true happiness.[13]

Not only did a representative of American Lutheranism speak out thus in behalf of the church's task. A similar emphasis was made by Dean J. Maroni of Norway and Inspector Louis Appia of France. Speaking on "The Lutheran Church and the Social Crisis," Dean Maroni noted that the church's aim is not merely to carry on works of a charitable nature but also "to maintain the high ethical claim of the Christian faith and love in all human relations" so that the church will stand "as the awakened conscience of the community, working the fundamental law of Christian love into the opinions of the people, in civil legislation, and in social life." In addition to relieving want and alleviating suffering the church has the task of creating a Christian opinion with regard to morality, legislation and social problems.[14]

Resolutions adopted by the 1929 LWC meeting included only brief reference to Lutheran cooperation in interdenominational efforts. In keeping with the recommendation of Dr. Knubel it was resolved that "Steps should be taken to have Lutheran missions more strongly represented henceforth in the International Missionary Council."[15]

At the LWC's 1935 meeting in Paris Dr. N. Astrup Larsen, from 1913 to 1927 a missionary to China from the NLCA, urged that the inward unity which exists among the various evangelical churches must find ways of expressing itself as a testimony to an unbelieving world.[16]

Except for the statements of individuals and the one 1929 resolution with reference to the IMC, the Lutheran World Convention did not express itself on the matter of Lutheran participation in interdenominational movements until in 1936 when a statement of principles was approved.

C. The 1936 LWC Statement on Ecumenical Relationships

As plans for the 1936 LWC Executive Committee meeting were being formulated Dr. Knubel, then first vice-president, with the approval of its president, Bishop Marahrens, asked Dr. Wentz to prepare a paper on "ecumenical relationships" which might serve as a basis for positive action by the Committee as a whole.[17] In his letter, dated June 2, 1936, Dr. Knubel included suggestions as to what should be included in the desired statement, adding that suggestions would also be made by the other members of the American Section.[18] When the Committee met in New York, September 29 to October 6, Dr. Wentz's presentation dealing with "the proper attitude of Lutheran bodies throughout the world towards ecumenical movements and general church activities" was adopted with but minor revisions. A final wording of the statement was left to him and Dr. Hanns Lilje, newly elected executive secretary of the LWC. Since the Scandinavian members of the Committee had not been in attendance at New York the adopted resolutions were submitted to them for approval.[19] Final details of the text having been completed, official translations made, and approval of the Scandinavian churches received, the LWC's declaration on "Lutherans and Ecumenical Movements" was first published in the March 12, 1937 issue of the NLC's News Bulletin and subsequently in church publications in Europe and America.[20]

Opening with a review of the growing trend toward ecumenicity and pointing to the need for a proper understanding of the various interchurch organizations and fellowships, the statement asserted that Lutheranism is itself an ecumenical movement, not only by virtue of its geographical distribution but especially because of its very nature and message. Its emphasis on personal faith in the God-Man Jesus Christ, as revealed in the Scriptures, is not hampered by any requirement concerning polity, liturgy or type of piety. Its doctrine of the Church, in which there is readiness to recognize true Christians under whatever name or organization they may be found, is similarly free of unnecessary requirements relating to local and temporal considerations such as form of organization, traditions, rites or ceremonies.[21]

The statement urged that Lutheran solidarity be cultivated so that the Lutheran churches of the world might the better help one another in preserving and sharing the Gospel with all nations. Any desire for ecclesiastical aggrandizement or the establishing of a super-church was disavowed. In order to achieve solidarity on a world scale it was recommended that all objectives of the LWC as expressed in the resolutions adopted by its general meetings be vigorously prosecuted, that a Lutheran consciousness in individual Lutherans and in Lutheran church bodies be cultivated, and, that in countries where Lutheran forces were not united, an effort should be made to unite them. A practical alliance among all the Lutheran churches of the world would make possible a harmonious voice and united action in regard to ecumenical movements and general cooperative organizations, those appearing to be evangelical being approved and those appearing unevangelical repudiated.[22]

It stated that all possible steps should be taken to deepen the evangelical consciousness of the Lutheran churches, that devotion to the person of Jesus Christ be intensified, fidelity to the revealed Word stimulated and churches of the LWC warned against such pernicious influences as atheism, secularism, syncretism, sectarianism and politico-ecclesiasticism. The development of a sense of common interest first of all with brethren in the faith was held to be important. In the consideration of possible relations with ecumenical movements care should be taken not to jeopardize Lutheran solidarity.[23]

The 1936 LWC statement did not tend to discourage Lutheran cooperation in interdenominational movements, but rather stressed principles and conditions on which basis participation might be approved. It called upon the Lutheran churches to approach all interchurch organizations in a spirit of catholicity, without hostility or prejudice "in the sincere and humble desire to render service and cooperate in works of Christian love."[24] This was to be done without any glossing over of genuine differences between the churches.

Five fundamental principles were set forth to guide the churches in their deliberations. (1) In ecumenical organizations all participating churches must be guaranteed the right to declare unequivocally what they believe concerning Christ and His Gospel, including freedom to testify definitely and frankly against error. Full assurance must be given that the testimony of every church be accorded a courteous and respectful hearing. (2) It must be clearly understood that the participating churches are not bound by any action of the group, nor are they to be considered responsible for any opinions expressed, except as the churches themselves adopt such actions or stated opinions as their own. (3) Ecumenical movements and organizations shall in all their assemblies, conferences and parts be constituted only of official representatives of church bodies. (4) The aims and undertakings of such organizations must lie within the proper sphere of church activity, which includes the preaching of the Word, the administration of the sacraments and works of Christian love. (5) Certain fundamental doctrines must be recognized such as the Fatherhood of God, the Godhead of Christ, the continued activity of the Holy Spirit, the supreme importance of Word and sacraments, the authority of the Scriptures, the reality and universality of sin, the redemption wrought in Christ, the present existence upon earth of the Kingdom of God, not as an external organization but as an object of faith, and hope of Christ's second coming.[25]

The 1936 LWC statement on "Lutherans and Ecumenical Movements" encourages participation in interdenominational organizations as a part of the church's stewardship of the Gospel. It stresses the importance of sound evangelical doctrine and insists that the contribution of the Lutheran churches of the world can be most effective if they cultivate and maintain a common approach to ecumenical questions. Since we shall later be calling attention to the LWC's endorsement of the monophysite formula, "our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour," which was made the doctrinal basis of the WCC, we note the tendency in the 1936 LWC statement to stress especially the deity of Christ. One of the doctrines listed as "fundamental to the Christian message" is "The true Godhead of Jesus Christ, and His redemption of the world by His life and death and resurrection; and His living presence in the Church." Earlier, however, reference is made to Jesus as the God-Man who is at the very center of the Lutheran Church's message.[26]

ULCA deliberations on interchurch relations are clearly reflected in the 1936 statement. A portion of the Washington Declaration, namely that listing fundamental doctrines, was incorporated literally in the LWC treatise.[27] The insistence that ecumenical organizations must guarantee every church "the right to declare unequivocally what it believes concerning Christ and His Gospel and to testify definitely and frankly against error" and "that such testimony will receive courteous and respectful hearing" was a stipulation carried over from the ULCA's 1920 declaration.[28] The provision that ecumenical organizations must espouse "only such purposes as lie within the proper sphere of Church activity" had back of it a similar provision in the earlier statement. The requirement that cooperative organizations must be constituted only of official representatives of church bodies reflects the repeated insistence by the ULCA that such movements should not include co-opted individuals.

D. 1937 and 1938 LWC Action on World Council Proposals

The 1937 meeting of the LWC Executive Committee was held at Amsterdam August 24-28, soon after the close of the Conferences which had authorized the formation of the World Council of Churches. Dr. Wentz reported to the Committee on the recent action as well as on plans which were being proposed. After some discussion a series of resolutions was unanimously adopted in which LWC President Marahrens was urged to accept membership in the "Constituent Committee" set up at Oxford and Edinburgh. He was instructed to represent the interests of world Lutheranism as those interests were expressed in the Executive Committee's 1936 statement on Lutherans and Ecumenical Movements. Especially emphasized was the principle of confessional representation:

> 3. We express our conviction that representation in the proposed General Assembly, the proposed Central Committee, and the proposed Committees and Commissions, should be ecclesiastical and confessional and not territorial, and we instruct President Marahrens to insist upon this principle.[29]

President Marahrens was asked to communicate with all member churches of the LWC informing them of proposals for a World Council, commending the general idea to them, and securing their reaction. It was resolved that completed plans for the Council should be approached with a united front. Each church should be asked to postpone final action until instructed by

President Marahrens as to the general attitude of all of the Lutheran churches of the world.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee was held at Uppsala, Sweden, May 21-25, 1938 soon after the Utrecht constitutional convention which failed to approve the Lutheran request that representation in the World Council be along confessional lines. Following a report of the Utrecht proceedings by Dr. Knubel and Dr. Long, the following resolution was adopted:

> The Executive Committee has heard the report of two of its members who participated in the ecumenical meeting at Utrecht from the 9th to the 13th of May, and records with satisfaction that the confession of our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour was unanimously adopted as the basis of the proposed World Council of Churches. We would emphatically state that thereby agreement in faith was acknowledged as the unavoidable requirement for a true unification of the churches. If Jesus Christ is confessed in the fullest sense as our God and Saviour, it involves that He is the only mediator between God and man and that we are justified before God only through faith in Him, the crucified and risen One. Only where the Gospel of Jesus Christ is rightly and purely taught and the Sacraments are administered according to the institution founded by Jesus will true Church unity be maintained, according to the testimony of the New Testament as confessed by our church.
>
> In the organization of the World Council this principle was practically applied in the case of the Orthodox Church, which as such is to have special representation in the proposed new organization. This corresponds factually with the principle of confessional representation expressed in our Amsterdam resolution of 1937. Although this principle was not carried through at Utrecht in the further arrangements for representation, we welcome the fact that the constitution provides for a possible change of the present arrangement as only a temporary one, leading to such a change. The Lutheran World Convention

> believes that only on a confessional basis will participation in the work possess permanent and hopeful prospect.[30]

That the LWC leaders should continue to insist on confessional representation as the proper implementation of the confessional principle is not at all surprising. It is a strange phenomenon, however, that those most outspokenly concerned with sound doctrine should openly endorse a monophysite Christology which for fifteen hundred years had been generally regarded as heretical.

The doctrinal basis of the World Council which affirms faith in "our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour," represents a departure from orthodox Christology as set forth in the Symbol of Chalcedon which dates back to the year 451. In the Chalcedonian statement it is not faith in Jesus Christ as God alone that is pointedly affirmed, but rather faith in him as the God-Man:

> We, then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one Person and

> one Subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the Same Son, and only begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets from the beginning have declared concerning him, and the Lord Jesus Christ himself has taught us, and the Creed of the holy Fathers has handed down to us.[31]

It cannot be questioned that Lutherans adhere to the Chalcedonian Christology. In the Augsburg Confession it is taught "that there are Two Natures, the divine and the human, inseparably conjoined in One Person, one Christ, true God and true man."[32] In Luther's Small Catechism faith is affirmed in "Jesus Christ, true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary."[33]

Nor has there ever been any espousal of a monophysite interpretation of Christ by any of the churches participating in the World Council, or in the Faith and Order movement from which the Council's doctrinal basis was taken over. When Dr. Remensnyder addressed the 1916 North American Preparatory Conference on Faith and Order's "Basic Call" he spoke of Jesus Christ as "God manifested in the flesh," "true God as well as true man," "the true divine-human Person."[34] At the 1920 Preliminary Conference held in Geneva Bishop Brent similarly interpreted the basis upon which the World Conference was organized:

> The call for a conference was issued. It was limited to those Christian communions throughout the world 'which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour.' It is not that there are not other sincere

> and true men who are reaching after God and endeavoring to find what His will is, but it seemed necessary that we should confine our fellowship to those who had a common and deep devotion to Jesus Christ, God and Man, and that we should join them in this conference.[35]

At Lausanne in 1927 the approved report on "The Church's Message to the World--The Gospel," affirmed that "in the fullness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate, and was made man, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, full of grace and truth."[36] The Affirmation agreed upon at Edinburgh declared: "We are one in faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word of God."[37] At Amsterdam, when the formula "Jesus Christ as God and Saviour" was formally approved as the basis for the World Council, the Message of the Assembly spoke of Christ as "His incarnate Word, who lived and died and rose from the dead."[38]

Quite clearly there was no inclination toward monophysite convictions either in Faith and Order or in the World Council. The fault was one of careless misstatement.

It can readily be understood why the churches were particularly concerned with a positive affirmation of faith in the deity of Christ. His humanity was not being questioned. But there were many who denied his deity or who interpreted his divine nature in such a way that it was the human Jesus that stood out. The conditioning factors which led to the churches' additional stress on Jesus' deity, however, did not justify their failure to accord proper recognition to his humanity. The Lutheran churches, especially, with their constant emphasis on the confessional principle and the importance of "pure doctrine," should have insisted that the doctrine most central in the Christian faith be correctly stated. Instead they failed even to question the accuracy of statement as it prevailed in the Faith and Order movement and later in the World Council.

CHAPTER IV

AMERICAN LUTHERAN PARTICIPATION IN THE UTRECHT CONFERENCE

A. The Washington Electoral Conference

On August 19, 1937, immediately following the Edinburgh Conference, a meeting of the newly constituted Committee of Fourteen was held in London to lay plans for the formation of the World Council. In order that the churches might be closely associated with every stage of the planning it was decided that they should be invited to send delegates to a preliminary conference which would draw up a provisional constitution. This constitution could then be submitted to the churches for ratification. It was agreed that twelve of the delegates should be representatives of the churches of America.[1]

At a joint meeting of the American members of the Faith and Order Continuation Committee and the American Section of the Life and Work movement held in New York City Sepptember 30, 1937 arrangements were made for the holding of an electoral conference by which the American delegates to the constitutional convention would be named. Each of the communions which had been officially invited to the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences was to be entitled to send a representative.[2] Three American Lutheran leaders participated in the electoral conference held January 10, 1938 at Washington, D. C. They were Dr. W. H. Greever of the ULCA, Dr. P. O. Bersell of the Augustana Synod and Dr. Walter E. Schuette of the ALC.[3]

During the course of the meeting representatives of the different denominational families were asked to meet separately to select a delegate and an alternate. When the conference as a whole reconvened Dr. Greever, speaking for the Lutheran group, placed in nomination the name of Dr. Knubel. He further proposed that the Lutheran alternate be one who would be named by the Executive Committee of the ALC. The nomination of Dr. Knubel and the recommendation in regard to an alternate were later approved along with the suggestion that both delegate and alternate should have the endorsement of the NLC.[4] While the Lutheran members of the electoral conference were fully agreed that Dr. Ralph H. Long, executive director of the NLC, should be the alternate they considered themselves incompetent to place his name in nomination without prior approving action by the ALC of which he was a member. In keeping with the oft repeated insistence that representatives to ecumenical organizations must be selected by the churches themselves Drs. Greever, Bersell and Schuette refrained from placing in nomination anyone who had not first been endorsed by his Lutheran church. Dr. Knubel had been named by the ULCA Executive Board as its nominee for delegate to the Utrecht conference.[5] The suggestion that the ALC Executive Committee choose the alternate left the way open for the appointment of Dr. Long. The provision that both principal and alternate be named and confirmed by the National Lutheran Council was in keeping with the principle of confessional representation as well as with the objective of Lutheran solidarity which had been emphasized in the 1936 LWC statement on Lutherans and ecumenical movements. The desired endorsement by the NLC was given at that body's January 26-27, 1938 meeting held in Detroit.[6] At a subsequent meeting of the ALC Executive Committee Dr. Long was officially named as an alternate. Later, when one of the American representatives from another denomination found it impossible to go he was seated as a full delegate.[7]

B. Informal Meeting of American Delegates to Utrecht

On April 1, 1938 the American delegates to the forthcoming provisional conference held an informal meeting in New York City. Early in the course of discussion Dr. Henry Smith Leiper brought up the question of the basis of representation in the World Council. He called attention to suggestions by the Baptists and the Lutherans that seats in the Council's Assembly should be made on a confessional rather than on a strictly geographical basis.[8] The "suggestions" to which he referred were those included in the August 1937 action of the LWC Executive Committee which we have already noted and those contained in resolutions adopted by the Administrative Committee of the Baptist World Alliance at their January 31, 1938 meeting in London.

Baptist leaders at that time were apprehensive over a World Council organized on the basis of territorial quotas. They feared that in the Central Committee, which in practice would be more important than the Assembly, the limited number of seats would be monopolized by the majority churches of an area. They warned that the minority churches, whose freedom and very existence is sometimes imperiled in countries where majority churches are closely allied with states increasingly totalitarian in outlook, would fail to have a much needed voice. They feared also that a Council organized along national lines would be ineffective when dealing with Life and Work issues involving international relations and policies in the political sphere. When faced with such problems it would either split along lines of national interest or be compelled to take refuge in an impotent and unworthy silence.[9] Leaders of the Baptist World Alliance closed their treatment of World Council plans with an open endorsement of the LWC's earlier action:

> While directing attention to these special points the Administrative Committee is constrained to go

> further and to record its agreement with the declaration of the Lutheran World Convention Executive Committee in its sessions at Amsterdam, August 24-28, 1937, that 'representation in the proposed General Assembly, the proposed Central Committee, and the proposed Committees and Commissions, should be ecclesiastical and confessional and not territorial.'[10]

The typewritten Agenda prepared in advance of the April 1, 1938 meeting of American delegates lists "Basis of representation" as the first of the "Issues likely to emerge at Utrecht." The first to speak on this question after it had been brought up by Dr. Leiper was Dr. Knubel, who set forth the position of the Lutheran churches on this matter. In the discussion that followed it was stressed that with regard to mission fields and some other areas the geographical approach was necessary so that it would probably be best to assign seats in the Assembly partly on a confessional and partly on a national basis. Dr. Cavert noted how the size of the Assembly would be affected by the method of representation used. Dr. Mott suggested that the method of selecting delegates should be governed in part at least by a consideration of the functions of the World Council which would include research work, educational undertakings and efforts to provide some kind of voice for the Christian conscience. He further urged that membership in the Central Committee should not be limited to members of the General Assembly.[11]

Since the later efforts of the Lutheran churches in behalf of confessional representation were sometimes mistakenly viewed as an attempt to secure membership in the Council for world confessional organizations it is of interest to note exactly what the Minutes of this early meeting report.

> Dr. Knubel explained very lucidly the Lutheran view. It was that each major denominational family should be assigned a certain total number of places. It is not thought that the Lutheran World Convention, or the World Baptist Conference should have delegates as such, but that each denominational organization of a world character should determine in its own way how it would assign to the different areas --national or otherwise -- the places at its disposal. This plan would tend to stress churchly aspects of life, rather than the strictly national or geographical, and would seem to be more in line with the genius of the Ecumenical Movement.[12]

Inasmuch as the informal meeting of American delegates had as its only purpose the discussion of questions which would be before the Utrecht conference no action of any kind was taken.

C. American Lutherans at Utrecht

A group of seventy-five delegates from the various churches of the world met in Utrecht May 9-12, 1938 to draw up a provisional constitution and to elaborate plans for the interim period prior to the convening of the First Assembly.[13] Two American Lutherans, Dr. Long and Dr. Knubel, were among those sharing in the deliberations. The latter was the chief spokesman in behalf of the Lutheran churches of the world in their request for representation along confessional lines.

As we have noted the LWC Executive Committee at its August 1937 meeting had instructed President Marahrens to represent the interests of world Lutheranism in keeping with the LWC's 1936 statement on ecumenical relationships. In his absence Dr. Knubel assumed the responsibility for presenting the Lutheran position.

While the LWC had made much of the issue of representation, the matter was dismissed rather lightly by most of the members of the Utrecht conference. It was generally felt that inasmuch as it would be the member churches themselves that would be naming their representatives the method of allocating seats to the churches was relatively unimportant.[14] Even the European Lutheran representatives at Utrecht failed to see any real need for representation along confessional lines.[15] It was therefore the decision of the conference that a specified number of seats in the Assembly and in the Central Committee should be allocated to each of the various geographical areas for assignment to the individual church bodies in whatever manner the churches of each area might decide. Provision was made for the Orthodox churches of the world to be represented along confessional lines, a specified number of seats being allocated to them for assignment to the individual churches in such manner as they might choose. Also, a small number of seats was to be reserved for minority churches which in the judgment of the Central Committee were not being adequately represented through primary allocating channels.[16]

The position of the LWC, urging confessional representation, was thus largely ignored. It was not even felt necessary to advance many arguments in favor of the method which was adopted. It was merely assumed that organization along geographical lines would be the most convenient way to proceed. However, in deference to the Lutheran request it was provided in the constitution that the method of representation approved at Utrecht was provisional in nature. While indeed the whole constitution as adopted in 1938 was provisional until such time as approved by the First Assembly, the only part that specifically declared itself to be of such a nature was Article V which twice stated that "The membership shall be allocated provisionally as follows." The American Lutheran delegates were encouraged to believe that a change might still be effected. Accordingly they joined in the action unanimously approving the provisional constitution.[17]

CHAPTER V

EARLY RESPONSES TO THE WORLD COUNCIL INVITATION BY LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA

A. The Augustana Synod

The Augustana Synod was the first Lutheran body in America to accept membership in the World Council of Churches. To its June 1938 convention President Bersell reported on ecumenical developments leading to the Utrecht conference. Stressing the importance of Christian unity he urged that Lutherans avail themselves of the opportunity to help mold the World Council while it was still in the process of formation. He recommended that the convention instruct the Synod's Committee on Reference and Comity to make a careful study of developments and submit a recommendation to Synod as soon as possible.[1] A resolution to this effect was adopted by the convention.[2]

The following year Dr. Bersell reported that he had not as yet called a meeting of the Committee and that since the First Assembly would not be held until 1941 the Synod would have ample time to give the matter further consideration and be prepared to make a final decision at the next annual meeting. He noted that Professor Eric H. Wahlstrom of the Augustana Seminary had been appointed to prepare a paper setting forth the Lutheran doctrine of the church to be read by him at a World Council commission scheduled to meet in Switzerland in July. Observing that it seemed a foregone conclusion that the European Lutheran churches would join the Council, he stressed the desirability of having unified action at least by the Lutheran churches of America. He reported that he had been appointed chairman of a committee of presidents of general Lutheran bodies which was to study the matter.[3] In keeping with President Bersell's suggestions delegates to the 1939 convention took action to receive the invitation to join the World Council, to refer it to the Committee of Reference and Comity for recommendation the following year, and to have the provisional constitution for the World Council printed in the Minutes of Synod.[4]

In June 1940 the Reference and Comity Committee, consisting of Drs. P. O. Bersell, Conrad Bergendoff, C. Albert Lund, O. J. Johnson, and E. E. Ryden, brought in the following report and recommendation which were unanimously approved:

> The Committee is of the conviction that the World Council of Churches is a much-needed gathering point for the Christian communions in the present dark hour of the world. Nothing in the constitution or program of the Council compromises the faith or order of any of the churches adhering to the Council. Your Committee therefore recommends that the Augustana Synod apply for membership in the World Council.
>
> In making application, it is further recommended, the Synod emphasize that its participation is dependent on the maintenance of the present basis, as stated in

> Article I of the constitution of the Council, namely, 'The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour.'
>
> The Augustana Synod, further, is of one mind with other Lutherans that the representation of Lutheran Churches in the Council shall be determined on a confessional basis, and not by geographical allocation.[5]

While the Augustana Synod in June 1940 voted to join the World Council, events were to transpire during the following year which cast a shadow upon the Synod's membership. On February 28, 1941 the St. Paul, Minnesota, Ministers Association sent out a letter publicizing an "Ecumenical Service of Worship" scheduled for Sunday afternoon, March 16. The letter which was sent to all Augustana Synod pastors of the area as well as to others urged participation in the service because of the Synod's membership in the World Council.[6]

Dr. Bersell registered an immediate protest with Dr. Leiper, secretary of the Joint Executive Committee of the American Sections of the Life and Work and Faith and Order movements. In a strongly worded letter he pointed out that union services were contrary to the principles and rules laid down by the Augustana Synod and contrary to the covenants into which the Synod had entered with other Lutheran bodies of America.[7] He declared that if Augustana had anticipated ~~that~~ its membership would be used for promoting local union services it would not have entered the Council. He went even a step further and expressed the judgment that if such a practice should be pressed in the future the Augustana Synod would withdraw. He reminded Dr. Leiper of the discussion upon the question of "unionistic services" which had been held at the December 5, 1940 meeting of the American Section for the World Council. At that meeting Dr. Bersell had stated that if his Synod's membership in the Council should compromise them in the matter of union services and joint communion services the other Lutheran bodies would take note and stay out of the movement. ULCA Secretary Greever had expressed full agreement. While the World Council could not be expected to control the actions of local ministerial groups or church federations the Joint Executive Committee might be able to give advice on the matter in question so that disturbances of this kind would be avoided.[8]

Dr. Leiper wax just leaving his New York office for a few days when he received Dr. Bersell's letter and at the time was able only to acknowledge the protest and give assurance that the World Council constitution in no way commits any of its constituent bodies to anything they do not desire to do. Dr. Leiper, who was scheduled to be in Omaha, Nebraska that week, sent a telegram to Dr. Bersell asking him to meet him at the airport in Minneapolis so that they might discuss the matter in person. Bad weather, however, made it necessary for him to send a second wire cancelling such arrangements. Dr. Bersell in a later letter expressed the opinion that the whole "rub" in the situation was that the American Committee was running ahead of the World Council still in process of formation and seemed to be promoting union services as a definite part of the propaganda for the Council. He warned that the situation was full of dynamite and expressed the hope that a way might be found out of the present difficulty.[9]

On March 18 Dr. Leiper sent a long letter to Dr. Bersell seeking to clear up the situation. He expressed regret that the St. Paul's Ministers Association had seemed to contravene the principles and rules of the Augustana Synod and assured Dr. Bersell that membership in the World Council in no way committed churches to participation in ecumenical services, the functions of the Council having to do primarily with the common action of the general bodies in such matters as may be agreed upon.[10]

Dr. Bersell's contention that a promoting of union services was a definite part of the propaganda for the World Council in America seems to have been quite correct as indicated by Dr. Leiper's favorable judgment as to their practical value. The latter noted that it had been the general assumption of practically all those associated with the movement that the worship services which had been so impressive at Oxford and Edinburgh, and in which Lutherans had participated, provided a means of drawing the churches closer together. He pointed to the fact that the Eastern Orthodox and the Anglican churches, which have strict canon laws concerning union services, have made specific exceptions in the case of those held in the interest of Christian unity. He stated that Dr. Bersell's was the first protest against such services in behalf of unity and confessed that he was a little puzzled by his strong objection. He added, however, that since union services were contrary to the principles and rules of their church body Dr. Bersell and the Synod were entirely justified in protesting to the St. Paul Ministers Association. He said that he, himself, would write to them that membership in the World Council was not to be used as a lever to try to bring Augustana pastors and congregations to act contrary to the rules of the Synod or its local congregations. In regard to joint communion services, to which Dr. Bersell had earlier also made reference, Dr. Leiper denied that any such were being sponsored by the World Council. In closing, he expressed the hope that no further occasion for offense would arise due to misunderstanding in some quarters as to the spirit and constitution of the Council.[11]

When properly understood and interpreted an occasional union service can help to bring together the Christian forces of a community and consolidate them for cooperative action, even while differences in doctrine admittedly still exist. Also, services in the interest of interdenominational or ecumenical understanding may be useful if their purpose is to acquaint pastors and members of the various churches with one another without any effort to suggest that unity between these churches has already been achieved. They become objectionable when their aim is an indication of unity not yet actual with a consequent minimizing of the importance of convictions of faith on which the churches still do differ. Union services cannot be accepted as a substitute for careful deliberation on theological questions nor as a short-cut to an outwardly united church.

Another occasion for offense was to arise very soon after the St. Paul incident. It was the trend of events at the June 3-5, 1941 meeting of The North American Ecumenical Conference. The Toronto conference had been called for the purpose of giving impetus to ecumenical endeavors in America and for finding ways to strengthen Christian unity so that it might withstand the divisive forces resulting from the passions and bitterness of war. Toward the realizing of these goals the conference proved to be a miserable failure. Instead of achieving a strengthening of Christian unity, the meeting developed into an effort to promote Anglo-Saxon solidarity with strong pressures in the direction of having the churches of the United States committed to intervention in the war on the side of Canada and Britain.[12]

Writing to Dr. Floyd Tomkins on June 18, 1941 in regard to Augustana's recent contribution to the work of the World Council Dr. Bersell referred critically to the unhappy developments at Toronto. He indicated that his Synod's continued participation would depend largely upon the ability of Council leaders to hold it on its intended track so as to remain true to the ecumenical spirit which had originally inspired its formation.[13]

Dr. Leiper, to whom Dr. Bersell had sent a copy of his letter to Tomkins, in a reply of June 23, 1941 asked the Augustana Synod president not to judge the World Council by the Toronto meeting of the North American Ecumenical Conference, which had actually not been a meeting of the Council. Indeed special efforts had been made prior to the meeting to make it clear that it was not being sponsored by the Council. This had been done because of the fact that it might be impossible for some of the speakers to avoid expressing strong convictions about the moral issues of the war which to others might seem unecumenical. He expressed regret that some of the speakers had deviated from the purpose of the gathering which had been to give fair treatment to the subject "The

Ecumenical Message and Mission of the Church." He asked Dr. Bersell to judge the World Council not by what had happened at Toronto but by the main work of the Council which was being done from Geneva to the satisfaction and praise of all acquainted with it.[14]

It is understandable that alarm over reported atrocities and a disregard for justice and human rights on the part of the Axis powers should stir up the minds and consciences of church leaders. The torture and mass murder of Jews, the violation of neutral countries, war crimes, the suppression of the churches and other developments might indeed make Christian leaders feel that an Allied victory was essential, and that accordingly the churches must throw their weight in favor of military intervention against a godless foe. A number of leading figures in the ecumenical movement were convinced that without such a victory there could be no World Council of Churches, nor any effective program by the churches. Even before the war delegates from the German churches had been prevented from going to the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences. A Nazi victory with German domination of Europe, Asia and Africa would leave the Americas as the only democracies on earth. However, should Britain win the churches would more likely be able to play an important role in shaping the new world.[15] A featured article in the Summer 1941 issue of

Christendom began with the words: "The task of our days is to destroy Hitlerism. This is a Christian task because Hitlerism is antichristian."[16]

The wrongs of the world are not righted simply by the achieving of military victory. The evil Nazi state was utterly defeated but seven devils even more wicked were unleashed to move on to the liquidation of countless millions in other parts of the world.

While the churches must indeed address themselves to the moral and social issues of the day it is a sad spectacle when they confuse the power of the Word with the power of the sword and become the propaganda arm or recruiting agent for the state. The supra-national nature of ecumenical organization dare not incline it toward silence or hedging when moral questions are at stake. But neither the World Council nor any of its parts has the task of issuing a call to arms either on one side or the other. The church's responsibility to transform men and to guide them toward consistent Christian living is not accomplished by pushing them into conflict. The weapon of the church is still the sword of the spirit, which is the Word of God.

In spite of the difficulties which we have noted, the Augustana Synod continued to share in the work of the World Council. Its Commission on Comity closed its report to the 1941 convention with the following affirmation:

> We are convinced that in these days of shattering experiences every effort seeking to hold Christians throughout the world together in closer fellowship should be encouraged. We believe that in future days the Augustana Synod will look back gratefully over its record of ecumenical interest in this pioneer period of ecumenical endeavor.[17]

The Synod's 1942 convention heard reports on the commendable work which the World Council was doing in the midst of the wartime conditions. Special reference was made to the Council's chaplaincy service to prisoners, including its visitors to prison camps, its distribution of thousands of parts of the Bible and its preparation of material for use by worshipping groups in the camps. Commended also was the work of its International Christian Press and of its World Council Currier, both of which gathered and disseminated information on a world-wide scope, and the Council's work among the refugees, which was one of the major items of its program. The Synod's Commission on Comity again affirmed the importance of continued participation in the Council, stressing that it was "a possible means in the Lord's hand for the redemption of this dark world," and asking for the Synod's continued prayer for and cooperation in its program.[18]

In June 1944 attention was directed to the proposed reorganization of the American Joint Committee for Life and Work and Faith and Order, which had been functioning provisionally as the American Section of the World Council. The

Articles of Organization for the proposed American Committee for the World Council were approved. In the approving action, however, a protest was made against the Articles' provision for consultative members to be elected by the Committee. The protest was made on the grounds that such an arrangement represented a policy of co-opting members, a policy against which the Augustana Synod had objected when first the World Council was projected.[19]

To the 1945 convention Dr. Bersell reported on his recent trip to Europe, stating that in his opinion one of the most valuable results of the visit by the three American Lutheran commissioners had come out of the conference which had been held in Geneva with the World Council leaders engaged in the work of reconstruction. A definite relationship had been established whereby the Lutheran churches would be adequately represented both in the general headquarters at Geneva and in all the national committees where the Lutheran Church would be involved either as a giving or a receiving church. Expressing gratitude for the spirit of fraternal concern and helpfulness evidenced by the non-Lutheran churches, he noted that the World Council already had twelve million dollars in sight for church rehabilitation in Europe, much of which would be used for the relief and strengthening of the stricken Lutheran churches.[20] In closing his report Dr. Bersell urged that "The voice of Lutheranism must be heard in the general councils of Evangelical Christians in this land and throughout the world."[21]

B. The United Lutheran Church in America

The ULCA Executive Board at its October 14, 1937 meeting received an extensive report on the Edinburgh Conference and on subsequent planning in preparation for the World Council of Churches. In his report Dr. Wentz suggested that the Board might want to be prepared to answer an invitation which would soon be coming from the American Section of Faith and Order and Life and Work to send an official representative to the proposed Electoral Conference by which delegates to Utrecht were to be named. In response to this suggestion Dr. Greever was chosen to represent the ULCA at Washington the following January and was instructed to place the name of Dr. Knubel in nomination as one of the American delegates to the World Council's constitutional convention.[22]

When the Board met on January 13, 1938 after Dr. Greever's return from the North American Electoral Conference it adopted the following resolution:

> That the U.L.C.A. co-operate in the formation of the proposed World Council of Churches, such co-operation to be not independent of but along with the other Lutheran Churches represented in the World Conference on Faith and Order, and on the basis formulated by the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention at its session in Amsterdam, in August, 1937.[23]

Much more conditional was a second resolution adopted on July 14, following Dr. Knubel's report on Utrecht's failure to approve the type of organization urged by the LWC:

> The United Lutheran Church in America is willing to cooperate for the present with the proposed World Council of Churches and authorizes the Executive Board to arrange for representation as necessary so long as the Executive Board deems it advisable. We express at the same time our entire agreement with the statement of the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention and emphasize the concluding words, 'that only on a confessional basis will participation in the work possess permanent and hopeful prospect.'[24]

Both resolutions were approved by the church's 1938 convention.[25]

Thus at an early date the ULCA, as a member of the World Conference on Faith and Order, was on record as favoring participation in the World Council. Whether it would move on to full membership would depend on the type of organization finally to emerge.

In September 1940 Dr. Knubel protested to Dr. Leiper concerning a circular which had been sent out by the Greater New York Federation of Churches in which it was announced that the World Council was sponsoring World-Wide Communion services. He reminded Dr. Leiper that the sponsorship of such services was completely contrary to an understanding reached earlier at a meeting at which he himself had been present.[26]

Dr. Leiper replied that he had drawn up a revised form of an earlier announcement but that the older form had by mistake been sent out to some areas. While not responsible for the error he regretted that it had been made and expressed confidence that Dr. Knubel would not hold it against the American Section of the World Council.[27]

At the 1940 ULCA convention only brief mention was made of the Council. While the church's Faith and Order commissioners had attended various meetings, none of the representatives authorized by the previous convention had been appointed, plans for the emerging World Council having been interrupted by the outbreak of the war in 1939. It was agreed that participation in organizational efforts be continued as part of the church's membership in Faith and Order.[28]

Considerable time and attention was given to the ecumenical question at the ULCA's 1942 convention. Deliberations were centered especially on a proposal that the church accept full membership in the Federal Council of Churches with which it had thus far maintained only a consultative relationship. After long discussion it was voted to continue on the same limited basis as in the past.[29] Turning attention to the World Council,Faith and Order commissioners Flack, Greever and Wentz reported that they had represented the ULCA at joint meetings of the American Sections of Faith and Order and Life and Work as well as at other conferences and committee meetings. They reported also on the work being carried on by the provisional organization of the World Council especially in its ministry to prisoners of war, the distribution of Bibles particularly in prison camps, assistance to refugees and internees, aid and relief to stricken peoples, its information service and study conferences. The hope was voiced that completion of the Council's organization might not be delayed too long.[30]

Dr. Wentz reviewed developments at the North American Ecumenical Conference held in Toronto in June 1941 to which we have already given attention.[31] While the conference had been called with the hope that Christian unity might be maintained in spite of passions stirred up by the war, the unscheduled lectures of "the flaming interventionist" Reinhold Niebuhr had turned the meeting into a clash between pacifists and interventionists. Instead of a deepening of the sense of oneness in a church which knows no barriers of race or nation, political and partisan feelings had been aroused. The Lutheran representatives had sounded a call for a return to the Bible and the means of grace, emphasizing that these, rather than human programs of social reform, are the basic vehicles of ecumenicity. The Lutheran witness had been courteously received but with only a few Lutherans at the conference little permanent influence had been made on the proceedings. Dr. Wentz concluded his report on Toronto with an appeal for a greater participation in ecumenical efforts by the ULCA and the Lutheran churches generally. While he regarded that 1941 meeting as "a terrible fiasco,"[32] he felt it would be a great mistake for Lutherans to withdraw from such contacts and adopt a policy of isolationism. Declared Dr. Wentz: "The remedy is not withdrawal but agressive witness through adequate representation."[33]

The same convention that rejected full membership in the Federal Council and gave but brief consideration to the World Council did take important action paving the way for eventual affiliation with the world organization when it approved the following authorizing resolution proposed by the Executive Board:

> It is recommended that the present relationship to the World Conference on Faith and Order be continued and that the U.L.C.A. participate in the formation of the World Council of Churches in which the future of the World Conference on Faith and Order is involved, and that the representatives of the U.L.C.A. insist that membership in the World Council of Churches be established primarily on the ecclesiastical basis, that is, membership by Church bodies, and not on the secular basis, that is, membership by national, racial or geographical groups ...; and that if and when this condition is satisfactorily met, the Executive Board be authorized, on behalf of the U.L.C.A., to accept membership in the proposed World Council of Churches.[34]

Five years were to pass before the authorization voted in 1942 was to be carried out.

When plans for the reorganization of the Joint Executive Committee for Life and Work and Faith and Order into the

American Committee for the World Council were reported to the 1944 ULCA convention,concern was voiced over proposals for consultative members which would be elected not by the churches but by the Committee itself. It was feared that this was a renewal of the policy of co-option against which the church had repeatedly protested. Dr. Knubel critized the American Committee for the World Council as being a self-constituted group having no real authority or right to speak for the churches they pretended to represent.[35] A resolution was adopted in which it was again urged that all representatives in the Council, its assembly, committees and commissions be selected by the churches themselves.[36] While the Augustana Synod at its June 1944 convention had voted approval of the American Committee, coupling with their approval a protest against the provision for co-opting consultative members, the ULCA took no action at all in regard to the reorganized Committee. Rather, it merely voted to continue the church's existing relationship to the developing Council through channels of the Faith and Order movement to which the ULCA was officially related.[37]

With the election of Dr. Franklin Clark Fry as ULCA president in October 1944 an important new figure moved onto the stage of ecumenical leadership. Soon after he assumed office discussions in regard to the church's relations to the

World Council were initiated by Dr. Leiper. On January 8, 1945, as a follow-up of a luncheon meeting, the latter wrote a letter in which he described the work of the Council and urged full participation by the Lutheran churches.[38] A week later, after a telephone conversation with Dr. Fry, he wrote a second letter in which he elaborated at great length on the organizational structure of the Council, defending the formation of the Joint Executive Committee and its successor, the American Committee. He noted how in England the responsibility for development of interest in the World Council, the raising of funds for the work of the Provisional Committee and practically all other administrative matters were being carried out by the British Council of Churches. In Canada the committee which had been set up by the member churches of the World Council had subsequently developed into the Canadian Council of Churches.[39]

Apparently in answer to ULCA insistence that only the World Conference on Faith and Order had been duly authorized by the churches themselves and not the subsequently constituted Joint and American Committees, Dr. Leiper maintained that it would have been a serious mistake to continue the Life and Work and Faith and Order movements separately after action to merge had been approved in 1937. To continue them jointly had required new organization of some kind. It was to fulfill this need that the American Sections of Life and Work and Faith and Order had formed the Joint Committee.

On January 16 Dr. Leiper also wrote to Dr. John R. Mott in regard to a letter which the latter had written some time earlier to the former ULCA president in which concurrence had purportedly been expressed with Dr. Knubel's view of the Joint and American Committees. Dr. Leiper warned that the Lutheran position with its stress on confessional representation, as over against a consolidated type of organization for each country, was in complete contradiction to the trend in England, Canada, and other countries, and that it would tend to sabotage the whole effort of the World Council to relate co-operative Christianity at a national level with world co-operative Christianity,while at the same time retaining the principle that representation in the Council be grounded directly in the participating churches. Admittedly very much disturbed by his talk with Dr. Fry, Dr. Leiper suggested to Dr. Mott that he clarify this matter with the Lutherans lest it be too late to change their attitude which seemed to be that of contemplating withdrawal from the World Council.[40]

A few weeks later Dr. Fry wrote Dr. Leiper expressing appreciation for the latter's clear and exhaustive statement on the background of the World Council and its organization. He gave assurance that the matter of interdenominational relationships had a high priority on his future calendar and that as soon as he completed a closer study of it he would be eager for further discussions.[41]

At the April 12, 1945 meeting of the ULCA Executive Board the church's Faith and Order Commission was appointed.[42] Inasmuch as ULCA participation in activities leading toward the formation of the World Council was still limited to its membership in Faith and Order, the question now arose as to what relationship existed or should exist with the recently created American Committee for the World Council. Having gained the impression from conversations with Dr. Fry that the Executive Board was not at that time inclined to appoint representatives to the American Committee, Dr. Wentz, a member of the Faith and Order Continuation Committee and of the Provisional Committee, wrote to the New York office of the World Council seeking clarification of his own status.[43] Miss Eleanor Kent Brown, assistant secretary in New York, replied that he was an ex-officio member of the American Committee by virtue of his membership on the Provisional Committee.[44]

Meanwhile, Dr. Leiper was still hopeful that the ULCA Executive Board would officially appoint representatives to the American Committee. On April 23, 1945 he wrote to Dr. Fry telling of the forthcoming visit to America by Dr. Visser 't Hooft and of the latter's expressed wish that Lutheran leaders might be well represented at the meetings at which he would be present. Dr. Leiper urged that if it should be impossible to get official confirmation of representatives to the American Committee before the coming of Dr. Visser 't Hooft, it would be desirable to have the ULCA send its Faith and Order commissioners to the forthcoming meetings. He added that invitations would be sent out directly by Dr. Tomkins in behalf of the World Conference on Faith and Order.[45]

Although the American Committee continued to list the ULCA as having accepted membership in the emerging World Council of Churches, by virtue of its continuing membership in Faith and Order and its expressed willingness to cooperate in the formation of the Council, it still was not at all sure that the ULCA would ever affiliate. There were grave difficulties pertaining to the organizational structure of the new world organization which would first have to be cleared up.

C. The American Lutheran Church

On March 24, 1944 Dr. Leiper wrote to ALC president, Emmanuel Poppen, in regard to his church's possible affiliation with the World Council. He noted that as far as could be determined from the records there had never been any response to the invitation which had been issued. He wondered whether the invitation had been received, and if so, whether any official action had ever been taken. He reported on the progress of the Council, noting that as of that time eighty-three denominations in over thirty countries had already accepted membership, among them a number of Lutheran churches. He called attention to the Lutheran members who were serving on the World Council staff and to the fact that a considerable amount of the Council's work was with and for Lutherans.[46]

Dr. Poppen replied on April 6 that he would present Dr. Leiper's communication to the Executive Committee of his church when it met on May 25. While the Committee did not have any authority to act in this matter, which rested alone with the church in convention assembled, he did want to discuss the matter with his colleagues.[47]

On April 17 Dr. Leiper wrote to Dr. Long, executive director of the NLC and head of the sub-committee for Europe of the Church Committee on Overseas Relief and Reconstruction which represented the churches of America as they collaborated with the WCC's Department of Reconstruction, asking the ALC leader how his church's Executive Committee might best be approached with reference to Council affiliation.[48] The latter replied that if the president should agree, it might be helpful for Dr. Leiper to be present in person at the May 25 meeting to discuss the matter of the Council in a formal way and to answer any questions that might arise.[49] Dr. Leiper immediately wrote Dr. Poppen as suggested.[50]

The ALC president was out of his office at the time attending the District conventions of his church. Upon his return he replied to the World Council's secretary that while he did not want to say "no" to the latter's offer, he felt it would be better for the time being merely to send a communication which might be discussed by the Executive Committee. Since the Committee had no authority in the matter it would not likely want to commit itself to any recommendation until after it had been referred to the thirteen Districts for consideration. Furthermore, the agenda for the forthcoming meeting was so filled there might not be even an hour which could be spared for the proposed presentation.[51]

In keeping with Dr. Poppen's suggestion Dr. Leiper sent a communication for consideration by the Committee together with literature on the World Council and its work. Knowing of the ALC's deep concern for relief to the many Lutherans in war-torn Europe, he called special attention to a statement prepared by Dr. Cavert after his return from Geneva two years earlier in which plans for a Department of Reconstruction had been outlined. It was noted that this department had since been set up and was already functioning under the chairmanship of Dr. Alphonse Koechlin of Switzerland. Included in the literature on the World Council was also a little booklet giving the story of the activities of the Provisional Committee in its program of relief in war-stricken areas. Aware of the deep respect in which Dr. Long was held, Leiper noted the former's role as chairman of the sub-committee for Europe of the Church Committee on Overseas Relief and Reconstruction.[52]

In the bulletin of reports prepared for the 1944 ALC convention the Executive Committee included the following recommendation:

> In view of the importance of world problems and the need of exerting sound Lutheran influence the Executive Committee recommends that the 1944 Convention of the Church give serious thought and consideration to the question as to how far it can participate in the program of the World Council of Churches.[53]

When the bulletin first came out Dr. Long overlooked the above recommendation and in conversation with Dr. Leiper reported that no reference was being made to the World Council. Disturbed over what was thought to be an omission, the latter wrote to Dr. Poppen calling attention to what had been reported by Dr. Long and expressing the hope that this would not mean that the matter of possible affiliation with the Council would be passed over without any consideration at a time when the need for the widest possible cooperation was so terribly urgent. To emphasize the problems and difficulties confronting the churches of Europe Dr. Leiper enclosed a copy of the latest documents dealing with plans for reconstruction aid. He further noted that by remaining aloof from the Council a church would be cutting itself off from its chaplaincy service to prisoners of war.[54]

The ALC president replied immediately quoting the recommendation which was being made to the convention and giving assurance that the question of his church's participation in the Council would indeed be considered by the forthcoming convention.[55] Dr. Leiper responded with a good-natured reply in which he expressed gratification over the recommendation and observing with a chuckle that their good friend Dr. Long "evidently didn't have on his glasses when he read the report of the Executive Committee."[56]

At the ALC's 1944 convention held in Sandusky, Ohio, the following resolution recommended by one of the floor committees of the convention was adopted:

> XI. WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
>
> WHEREAS, the complex world situation places the Church before ever-increasing responsibilities that demand united and energetic action; and
>
> WHEREAS, participation in the program of spiritual rehabilitation, especially in the field of service to prisoners of war and similar problems, depends largely upon participation in the program of the World Council of Churches; and
>
> WHEREAS, the World Council of Churches has no constitutional authority whatever over its constituent churches, and exists only to serve the churches and not to control them; and

> WHEREAS, we believe that ways and means of co-operation with the World Council of Churches without sacrifice of principle can be found;
>
> THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the Executive Committee of the Church be authorized to give careful study to this matter and to enter into such relationships as it may deem necessary, provided, however, that the confessional position of the American Lutheran Church is not violated.[57]

Following the convention Dr. Poppen reported the above action to Dr. Leiper assuring him that although the Executive Committee would not be meeting before the beginning of 1945, its members would meanwhile be asked to make a study of the World Council as directed by the recent convention.[58]

On February 14, 1945 Dr. Poppen wrote that "participation in one form or another in the World Council of Churches" had been given consideration at the Executive Committee's February 10 meeting. He asked Dr. Leiper to supply further information as to financial and other involvements in the event the ALC would decide to apply for membership.[59]

Thus we note that by the summer of 1945 the ALC had already given considerable attention to the question of possible affiliation with the World Council. The way was prepared for definite action in the near future.

CHAPTER VI

RENEWAL OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD CONVENTION

A. The Effect of World War II upon the LWC

The Lutheran World Convention, organized partly as the result of cooperative efforts growing out of World War I, suffered greatly from the conflict that broke out in 1939. The churches of Germany, already suffering under the heel of Nazi tyranny, were rendered completely impotent as far as participation in international organizations was concerned. With the German invasion of Denmark and Norway and the Russian subjugation of Finland, the Church of Sweden was the only European Lutheran church that remained free to act with any degree of independence. However, even though a neutral, lines of communication to and from Sweden suffered greatly. The main burden of Lutheranism's world organization was carried on by the LWC's American Section.

Added to the physical disabilities were the mounting tensions growing out of the war. The Scandinavian countries came to be filled with bitterness toward Germany as neutral countries were violated and as news spread of the atrocities perpetrated by the Nazis.

To make matters even worse, President Marahrens' compromising attitude toward Naziism discredited the LWC in many eyes. The ties which normally linked Lutheran Scandinavia with the land of the Reformation were severely strained when Denmark and Norway were overrun and placed under the tyrant's heel. With Bishop Marahrens as its president and Dr. Hanns Lilje as its executive secretary, the Swedish churchmen came to look upon the LWC as being under German domination and undeserving of much attention. Except for efforts by the American Section it is questionable whether Lutheranism's world organization, still comparatively recent in origin, would have survived World War II, or, at least, that its revitalization would have come in time to have it render any significant contribution to the early post-war period.

B. American Efforts to Revitalize the LWC

In 1944 the American Section appointed Dr. Bersell and Dr. Long to go to Sweden at the earliest possible time to confer with Swedish church leaders in regard to a possible program of reconstruction and rehabilitation for the countless Lutherans in war-devastated Europe. Some months were to pass before it was possible for them to go. Meanwhile, agreement was worked out with the Missouri Synod for joint cooperation in the forthcoming relief program.[1] Accordingly, a representative of that Synod, Dr. Lorenz B. Meyer, was asked to accompany Drs. Bersell and Long on their mission.

Leaving Washington, D. C. in an Air Transport Command plane on February 28, 1945 the three men spent the next six and a half weeks visiting Scotland, England, Sweden, Switzerland, and France.[2]

On March 25 at Sigtuna, Sweden, they met with the Swedish National Committee of the LWC including Archbishop Eidem, Bishop Edvard Rodhe, Probst Pehr Pehrson, Dean Yngve Rudberg, Professor Lars Wollmer, Professor Knut Westman and Director Thor Borgveall. In the discussions Dr. Bersell and Dr. Long reported the desire of the Lutheran churches of America to join hands with the Lutherans of Sweden in the post-war rehabilitation work. They hoped that such work might be a cooperative effort in the name of the LWC. As soon as international conditions permitted the other Lutheran churches of the world would then be able to join in the efforts. They stressed the importance of a reestablished and strengthened Lutheran world organization.[3]

The Scandinavian leaders, however, were at first not at all enthusiastic over the LWC. Few held much hope for its future. The anti-German feeling was so strong that in regard to proposed plans for a relief program they suggested that the Swedish Church assume responsibility for the Finns, the Norwegians, the Danes and the Balts, while the Americans take care of the Germans and the rest.

The American commissioners continued to push for a united effort by a revitalized LWC until finally the Swedish leaders came to see the wisdom and desirability of such a plan. In order to pave the way for a reorganization of the LWC Archbishop Eidem volunteered to ask Bishop Marahrens to resign as president and to call a conference of its Executive Committee. In order to expedite early joint action a European Liaison Committee was set up through which united relief efforts were to be channeled. Bishop Rodhe was made its chairman with Archbishop Eidem as honorary chairman.[4] Dr. Long, Dr. Fry and Director Borgveall were later also named to this committee.[5]

C. LWC Revitalization Linked to Cooperation with the WCC

One of the conditions of the agreement reached at Sigtuna was that the plans agreed upon be approved by the World Council of Churches to which the Church of Sweden had already made definite commitments.[6]

On April 2 the commissioners of the LWC's American Section met in Geneva with representatives of the WCC's Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid. The commissioners reported on the liaison committee which had been constituted by the American and Swedish churchmen. Spokesmen for the Reconstruction Department stated that they would be glad to collaborate with the newly formed committee in order that all relief work might be efficiently coordinated. It was pointed out that the Council's policy was not to centralize all interchurch aid or to interfere with the direct relationships between churches of the same confessional family, but rather to provide for a process of consultation which would help avoid overlapping and friction and insure the most effective distribution of relief to all stricken churches. The department offered its services to the Lutheran churches in the making of surveys of church needs, in the transmission of appeals from Lutheran churches, and in the forwarding and control of earmarked funds to churches. In return the department asked that the LWC liaison committee keep it fully informed concerning its plans and activities and the aid given to Lutheran churches. It was agreed that the process of consultation and mutual information should take concrete form in the appointment of a Lutheran representative to serve in Geneva as liaison officer between the Lutheran churches and the Council's Reconstruction Department, such representative to be given a seat on the aid committee of the department.[7]

Upon the commissioners' return to the United States the American Section of the LWC proceeded without delay to secure an early implementation of the agreements reached at Sigtuna and Geneva. On July 3, 1945 Dr. S. C. Michelfelder, an ALC pastor in Toledo, Ohio, sailed for Geneva to begin his assignment as liaison between the Lutheran churches of America, the Lutheran World Convention and the World Council of Churches.[8] On the same boat with Dr. and Mrs. Michelfelder were Dr. Stewart Herman of the ULCA, likewise bound for Geneva to serve on the WCC staff, and his wife. These two men were to play important roles in the relief, rehabilitation and resettlement programs of the Council and of the Lutheran World Federation, successor to the LWC.[9]

A formal reorganization of the LWC was to be delayed until July 1946 but already more than a year earlier its renewal was under way, and that in close cooperation with the World Council of Churches.

CHAPTER VII

THE LUTHERAN PETITION IN BEHALF OF CONFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION

A. ULCA Calls Conference of American Lutheran Leaders

On July 12, 1945 the ULCA Executive Board adopted a resolution instructing President Fry to invite representatives of all Lutheran bodies in America to a special conference "for the purpose of achieving a common understanding with reference to the World Council of Churches."[1] The action came as a result of a meeting on the preceding day between members of the church's Committee on Inter-Lutheran Interests, Drs. Fry, H. H. Bagger, P. H. Krauss and Mr. J. K. Jensen, and representatives of the American Section of the LWC, Drs. Knubel, Wentz and Theodore Tappert. That Dr. Knubel, spokesman for confessional representation at Utrecht, led in urging such a procedure is indicated in Dr. Fry's August 3 letter to Dr. Wentz in which he referred to the "constructive achievement" resulting from the July 11 conference with the retired ULCA president.[2]

In preparation for the all-Lutheran meeting Dr. Fry was in frequent contact with the New York office of the World Council, both by letter and in personal conference with Drs. Cavert and Leiper. The latter recalled that European Lutherans had not supported Dr. Knubel's position at Utrecht and that as a result the constitution in its present form had been unanimously adopted. It was Dr. Leiper's opinion that confessional representation had failed to secure approval not so much because of any objection in principle but because it was felt that most churches were so organized that it would be impossible for them to be represented along such lines. Some of the Lutherans at the Utrecht conference had felt that they lacked a world organization of sufficient authority which could serve as an effective agent in the selecting of representatives from all its component parts.[3]

Dr. Fry, however, insisted that Lutheran zeal for confessional representation was far more wide-spread than Dr. Leiper seemed to think. He directed the latter's attention to the Minutes of the May 1938 meeting of the LWC Executive Committee which show that the entire Committee, of whom two-thirds were European, had unanimously adopted a vigorous, unequivocal resolution upholding the Lutheran position as presented at Utrecht by Dr. Knubel. Dr. Fry expressed the judgment that representation in the World Council as provided in the provisional constitution apparently carried on the traditions of Life and Work rather than those of Faith and Order. He reminded Dr. Leiper that it had been over the representation question that the ULCA had withdrawn from the Life and Work movement.[4]

Following an August 1 Church House conference with Drs. Cavert and Leiper the ULCA president wrote the latter posing certain specific questions relating to the World Council, namely, as to the activities or types of activity in which it would engage, what benefits a church would derive from membership aside from "the vague feeling of ecumenicity," and what financial obligations would likely be involved.[5]

In his reply Dr. Leiper pointed out that according to its provisional constitution the World Council would continue the work of the two organizations to which it was successor. Each of these would become a commission of the new body at the convening of the first Assembly. The Assembly, wherein full power would rest, would have the responsibility of defining what the continuing work of Life and Work and Faith and Order would be. The Council would undertake such tasks as would be assigned to it or requested of it by the constituent churches, subject to the approval of the Central Committee. For the time being it seemed clear that activities in the realm of study and inter-church aid would be continued. As to the benefits which would come to the churches joining the Council these would be most tangible in the case of those needing assistance. For the strong churches the main benefit would be spiritual identification with the Church Universal of which no full earthly embodiment exists. All member churches would be entitled to a full use of the services of the World Council's staff. The Assembly would promote a new efficiency of operation in dealing with matters of worldwide concern. Authoritative sources of information would become available. A better opportunity would be afforded to give substance to the idea of Christian world community. The constituent churches would be brought into a fellowship which would be both visible and practical. The teachings of the churches would acquire a new relevance and self-evidencing quality. There would be no financial obligation in a strictly legal sense. Member churches would merely be asked to share in the small budget of the Council. Apportionment figures assigned would be only in the form of suggested quotas. Participation in reconstruction and inter-church aid, not being combined with the administrative budget, would be left entirely to the authorities of the member churches.[6]

Thoroughly acquainted with the history, aims, program, policies and organizational structure of the World Council, and with official documents, publications and statements by responsible officials in hand, Dr. Fry was well prepared for the meeting he had called.

B. American Lutheran Agreement on Confessional Representation

Representatives of nine Lutheran church bodies of America met in Columbus, Ohio on September 6, 1945 in response to the invitation sent out by Dr. Fry. The churches represented were the American Lutheran Church, the Augustana Synod, the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Free Church, the Missouri Synod, the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, the Suomi Synod, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church and the United Lutheran Church in America. When the meeting was convened Dr. Fry was elected chairman and Pastor S. E. Engstrom of the Augustana Synod secretary.[7]

Dr. Fry opened the conference with a comprehensive introductory statement which included a review of action taken by the ULCA with reference to the World Council. He indicated that as long as the present provision for allocating seats prevailed his church could not accept membership, but that it would be willing to affiliate if the method of representation were changed. He emphasized the urgency of immediate action. With the war now over the time was rapidly approaching when the Council would be formally organized and the constitution finally adopted. He could see no hope for the securing of confessional representation unless Lutherans of the world unite in insisting on it. And before an approach to European Lutherans could be made there must first be as united a front as possible among the Lutheran churches of America.[8]

In the discussion that followed the feeling seemed to prevail from the beginning that confessional representation was an indispensable prerequisite for Lutheran participation. Special attention was called to the constitutional provision that the World Council was a "fellowship of churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour." The partial nature of this statement and its consequent monophysite character does not seem even to have been noted.

Upon a motion approved by the conference a resolutions committee was appointed consisting of Drs. Bersell, W. G. Sodt, and Wentz with Drs. Fry and Long as advisers. A report of this committee was submitted at the afternoon session and adopted in the following form:

Preamble and Resolutions

> Whereas, We who are assembled here at Columbus, Ohio, on this sixth day of September, 1945, as official representatives of the following American Lutheran general bodies, American Lutheran Church, Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church, Lutheran Augustana Synod, Lutheran Free Church, Norwegian Lutheran Church, Suomi Synod, United Evangelical Lutheran Church, and United Lutheran Church in America, feel keenly the present distresses and emergencies which beset the Lutheran Church of the world and its need for ever greater strength and unity, and
>
> Whereas, We earnestly desire to extend the influence of our Lutheran testimony within the entire Christian world community through the generations,
>
> Therefore, be it resolved:
>
> A. It is the sense of this meeting that the Lutheran bodies which have already accepted the invitation to become members of the World Council of Churches in process of formation, and those who may accept the invitation, shall

(1) approach the Provisional Central Committee of the World Council of Churches in process of formation, insisting that the provisional constitution of the World Council be amended so as to provide for Lutheran representation in both the Assembly and the Central Committee on a confessional basis, and

(2) approach the American Section of the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention to take measures to implement any provision in the constitution of the World Council of Churches that would secure both in the Assembly and in the Central Committee of the World Council proportionate representation of all the Lutheran Churches adhering to the Lutheran World Convention.

B. It is the sense of this meeting that, in order to achieve that the principle of confessional representation of Lutherans be incorporated in the constitution of the World Council of Churches, it is highly desirable that the Lutheran Bodies of America and the Lutheran Churches of the World should unite in insisting upon it.[9]

Although the representatives of the Missouri Synod participated in the discussions of the conference and a statement was made by Dr. Behnken along with the other presidents of the general bodies, only the eight churches affiliated with the National Lutheran Council became parties to the American Lutheran petition for confessional representation. The Missouri Synod president indicated that his church was committed to doctrinal unity rather than a joining with many groups. He spoke words of caution against contemplated membership in the World Council by the other Lutheran churches of America.[10]

At the close of the meeting, as an evidence of the enthusiasm and gratification over its happy outcome, an expression of thanks was extended to Dr. Fry and the ULCA Executive

Board for having assumed the initiative in calling the leadership of American Lutheranism together for achieving a common understanding with reference to the World Council.[11]

While the resolutions were not actually in the form of a petition, but rather a statement of principle and intention, they have come to be thus designated, especially since Dr. Wentz's subsequent presentation to the Provisional Committee began with the words:

> To the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches: A Petition Concerning Confessional Representation.[12]

It was indeed a significant meeting which was held at Columbus, Ohio in September 1945. The agreement there reached paved the way for a united Lutheran approach to the World Council in behalf of the principle of confessional representation. ~~But~~ Much concentrated effort was still required before the goal set forth in the resolutions could be realized. Endorsement by the LWC was essential. Approval by the Council's Provisional Committee was necessary before any proposed amendment to the constitution could even come before the Assembly for consideration. But at least a beginning had been made.

CHAPTER VIII

SUCCESSFUL EFFORTS TO SECURE APPROVAL OF THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN PETITION IN BEHALF OF CONFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION

A. American Section Sends Commission to Europe, November 1945.

On November 11, 1945 three of the four American members of the LWC Executive Committee sailed for Europe to make a survey of the religious situation and to confer with European Lutheran leaders. The specific objectives of their trip included (1) the reestablishing of a functioning LWC Executive Committee, which had been made inactive by the outbreak of hostilities in 1939, (2) the setting up of effective working arrangements with relief and welfare agencies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany, (3) the securing of approval for the American petition for confessional representation by the European Lutheran leaders and (4) the determining of a future program in regard to orphaned missions being supported by the Lutheran churches of America.[1]

The commission consisted of J. A. Aasgaard, president of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, Long and Fry. The vacancy in the American Section resulting from the death of Dr. Knubel on October 16 was filled by the appointment of Dr. Fry just prior to his sailing for Europe. On November 5 Long urged that Fry be named without delay so that he might have a vote in the forthcoming meeting of the reconstituted LWC Executive Committee.[2] Dr. Wentz, president of the Section, in his letter approving the appointment, asked that the Committee take definite action authorizing a united presentation in behalf of confessional representation to the Provisional Committee meeting in Geneva the following February.[3] The desired endorsement of the American petition by the LWC was to come, but not as soon as anticipated.

B. Copenhagen Meeting of LWC Executive Committee

Two weeks before the departure of the American commissioners a cable was sent to Archbishop Eidem asking that he call a meeting of the LWC Executive Committee. This was in keeping with the agreement reached at Sigtuna some seven months earlier. However, when Aasgaard, Fry and Long arrived in Europe they found that little if anything had been done. They chanced to meet Bishop Berggrav in London on November 20 who volunteered to inquire immediately in regard to the matter. His efforts brought quick results and the desired meeting was held at Copenhagen December 16-17, 1945.[4]

It was the first meeting of the Committee since May 20-25, 1939.[5] Another had been planned for Copenhagen during the latter part of April 1940, but the invasion of Denmark a few weeks earlier made necessary its cancellation.[6] No further meeting was possible during the course of the war.

Present at Copenhagen were Bishop Rodhe representing Archbishop Eidem who could not attend on account of an operation he had recently undergone, Pastor Harjunpaa representing the Archbishop of Finland, Bishop Fuglsang-Damgaard and Alfred Jorgensen of Denmark, all from the Scandinavian Section, and the three American members, Aasgaard, Fry, and Long.[7] The absence of a representative from the Church of Norway and of the whole German Section kept it from being a meeting of the whole Executive Committee. It was rather a joint meeting of members of the American and Scandinavian Sections acting for the full Committee.

The resignation of Bishop Marahrens, which had been handed to Dr. Fry on November 27 during the latter's survey visit to Hannover,[8] was accepted and Archbishop Eidem named to succeed him as president. Professor Olaf Moe of Norway was elected vice president and Dr. Michelfelder executive secretary.[9]

Among the items considered was the American Lutheran proposal for confessional representation.[10] After some discussion it was decided that it be referred to all member churches of the LWC for their consideration. The American Section was delegated to draw up and send out a communication. While the American proposal, was looked upon favorably the action taken did not constitute the endorsement and authorization which Dr.

Wentz desired to have for his forthcoming presentation to the Provisional Committee. Even the measure of support indicated at Copenhagen was to lack official status when Eidem subsequently refused to recognize the December meeting as having been a valid one. This refusal, which Wentz reported to the American Section on March 22, 1946,[11] was not surprising in view of the limited attendance and since it had first been called while Bishop Marahrens was still president.

The net effect of these developments was that when Dr. Wentz presented the petition for confessional representation at Geneva the following February it was officially a proposal only of the Lutheran churches of America rather than one of the whole LWC as American proponents had hoped it might be.

D. Efforts to Win Approval of World Council Leaders

On December 7, 1945 Dr. Fry met with officers and members of the Administrative Committee of the World Council to present the position of the Lutheran churches of America in regard to confessional representation.[12] Aasgaard and Long, who were in Geneva shortly ahead of Fry, were unable to get anywhere on the matter. Some progress, however, was made at the December 7 luncheon meeting in which Fry participated. The following day when he met again with Visser 't Hooft, S. M. Cavert, J. H. Cockburn and Marc Boegner he pointed out that all that the Lutheran churches of America were asking was that the LWC be recognized as an electoral assembly which would have the authority to allocate to the Lutheran churches of the world the seats in the World Council Assembly and Central Committee to which they would be entitled. The LWC would work in close cooperation with the officials of the Council. Under such an arrangement the Lutherans would be willing, for example, to have the Council indicate in which years the LWC should include representatives from China in its elections. They would agree to an informal understanding about the various areas, especially those of the younger churches, so that there might be balanced representation at all given meetings of the Assembly.

Dr. Cockburn replied that at the Utrecht conference some of the Presbyterians had supported the principle of confessional representation and that if interpreted in the sense outlined by Fry at least some Presbyterians might be expected to give support to the Lutheran proposal at the Council's first Assembly. Cavert, however, was apprehensive that the Lutheran request was actually an effort to secure membership for the LWC itself instead of being a request only to have the latter serve as an electoral assembly allocating allowable seats to the various Lutheran churches.

Fry replied that there was no thought or desire of doing that. Such an arrangement would not only be undesirable, but legally impossible since the World Council was being organized as a council of churches. He asserted that Lutherans positively wished and insisted that churches should join as churches.

Following this pointed clarifying statement Cockburn stated that his objection to the proposal was materially lessened. Dr. Boegner, who had earlier expressed himself to the effect that any consideration of confessional representation by the Provisional Committee at their forthcoming meeting in Geneva would be illegal, said that he now saw the practical wisdom of it.

Visser 't Hooft was more difficult to persuade. He seemed to feel that the request coming from the Lutheran churches of America, comparatively small in number and unable to get together among themselves, was not well grounded nor justified. He stated that, furthermore, it would be difficult to compute the membership of the Lutheran churches in order to assign to them a certain number of seats for allocation to the various churches of the LWC. Fry insisted that the same difficulty would have to be faced in assigning seats on a geographical basis. The World Council secretary thought it was unfortunate that the constitution had assigned specific numbers of seats in its provision for representation.

When Fry suggested that it would matter little to the World Council if the Lutheran churches of America stayed out, Visser 't Hooft replied that their membership was indeed of great importance. Should they fail to affiliate the Scandinavian churches, while they would remain in the Council, would do so with a divided heart.[13]

On January 2, 1946, after his return to America, Dr. Fry mailed Visser 't Hooft a copy of the full text of the Minutes of the September 6 meeting of Lutheran representatives. The latter replied a few weeks later that it now seemed clear that the whole question of confessional representation would have to be discussed at the forthcoming meeting of the Provisional Committee. He added that he was glad several of the men present at Columbus would also be at Geneva.[14]

The Provisional Committee on February 21-23, 1946 met in full for the first time since January 1939.[15] Among the many items coming up for consideration was the proposal of the Lutheran churches of America.[16] During an extended period of discussion Dr. Wentz presented his "brief" in behalf of confessional representation. In it he reminded his fellow members on the Committee that the constitution as approved at Utrecht clearly declared itself to be provisional in regard to the allocating of seats and that Article V was thus readily subject to revision. Noting that the provisional allocation was in one instance to a family of churches, in another to regional areas and in still another to minority churches channeled through their world confessional organizations, he pointed out that Lutherans desired an extension of the first method so that it might apply to them also. They were not seeking membership in the Council for the LWC nor a disproportionate number of seats. They were not insisting that other churches must be thus represented. They were simply asking that a proper number of seats in the Assembly and Central Committee be allocated to the Lutheran churches of the world, the assignment of them to the member churches to be left to the LWC.

Because of what the World Council professed to be and proposed to do it seemed to the Lutheran churches that representation should be established along confessional rather than regional lines. The constitution clearly stated that it is a fellowship of churches. The organization of the Council in all its parts should emphasize this basic fact rather than suggesting that it is a kind of "ecclesiastical League of Nations," or a platform for contacts among regional segments of Christendom. An emphasis on the churchly nature of the Council rather than on area divisions would help guard it from becoming a mere platform for ecumenical specialists and aid in establishing it as an organization consisting of official delegates chosen by the churches, speaking for the churches and responsible to the churches. Inasmuch as one of the important functions of the Council was the mobilizing of the witness of the churches for concrete prophetic action the Lutheran churches were convinced that they could best contribute toward this end if permitted to proceed in cooperation and consultation with one another.

Dr. Wentz stated that Lutherans were convinced that the World Council would move more quickly and more certainly toward a united testimony if the churches associated in confessional groups, speaking frankly with one another in a friendly comparison of views, than they would if Christians approach one another as national or geographical groups. A united witness would be hindered more by sectionalism than by sectarianism.[17]

The American Lutheran petition for confessional representation was received with polite coolness by the Provisional Committee. Most of those present felt that the proposal represented the wishes of only a small group in America alone while the invitations to participate in the formation of the World Council had been accepted by the churches on the basis of the constitution as approved at Utrecht.[18] Even though some members of the Administrative Committee with whom Dr. Fry met on December 8, 1945 had finally expressed themselves as being favorable to the proposal, the Provisional Committee was not yet ready to recommend that the method of representation be changed. So it was agreed "to receive the petitions of the American Lutherans with sympathetic appreciation" and to refer the request to the Committee on Arrangements for the First Assembly for additional study and possible recommendation.[19]

On February 27, a few days following the close of the Provisional Committee sessions, Wentz had further conversations with Visser 't Hooft. In answer to a question why at World Council headquarters there was such resistance to the Lutheran petition, the latter cited five reasons: (1) The suggestion did not seem to be a practical one. It would raise insuperable difficulties which would only serve to introduce confusion into the practical administration of the matter of representation. (2) The proposal was that of the Lutheran churches of America alone. There seemed to be no desire for confessional representation on the part of the great Lutheran bodies in Europe. It was inaccurate to claim that the Lutherans of the world were asking for it. (3) Should the request of the Lutheran churches of America be granted other churches would want it too. The probability that there might arise a general demand for confessional representation would greatly complicate matters in view of the fact that there were some Christian groups that could not be associated with any confessional classification. (4) If confessional representation were to be made the basis of allocating seats, whether for one or several groups, it would not be possible to assure geographical balance in the World Council. The result might easily be that one part of the world, for example the continent of Europe or North America, would have an overwhelming preponderance of representation. Should such a thing come to pass it would seriously impede the smooth working of the Council. Dr. Visser 't Hooft stressed the importance of having the various parts of the world adequately and proportionately represented because the various areas have much to learn from one another in spiritual matters. He noted, for example, that the churches of Europe which had gone through the fire of suffering had much to teach the churches in America while, conversely, the Christians of America, full of vigor and enterprise, had much to teach the rest of the world. (5) There was apprehension, even among some Lutherans, that if confessional representation were adopted the individual church bodies would be only indirectly related to the World Council.

Dr. Wentz asked whether World Council officials would still object if it could be shown that the proposal was capable of practical application, that it would not seriously disturb the geographical balance in the Council, and that it represented the desire not only of the Lutheran churches of America but a majority of the Lutherans of the world. Dr.

Visser 't Hooft gave assurance that there would be no further objection if the American Lutheran proposal could be shown to be practicable.[20]

D. Voices Raised Against Confessional Representation

The issue of geographical versus confessional representation was not widely debated until after the February 1946 meeting of the Provisional Committee. At Utrecht proponents of the former method never felt their proposals to be seriously challenged. While Dr. Knubel pushed for confessional representation there was so little sympathy for the LWC position that it was not considered necessary to give any extensive development to arguments in favor of the method which was unanimously approved. Reports on the meeting included little, if any, reference to the issue. Most delegates to the World Council's constitutional convention looked upon geographical representation as being the simplest and most practical way to proceed. When the Lutheran churches of America reopened the question and their petition was referred to the Committee on Arrangements for further consideration and possible recommendation, arguments in opposition to it were called forth.

In a symposium appearing in the Summer 1946 issue of Christendom Dr. Earl Frederick Adams, a Baptist, warned that adoption of the Lutheran proposal would introduce almost insuperable problems for the "congregationally organized" churches. To him the very idea of confessional representation was so foreign to his normal thought patterns that it was necessary for him to ponder it for a while before being able even to begin to arrive at any reasoned convictions on the matter. In his opinion that which was being proposed was completely contrary to basic principles of democracy in ecclesiastical organization. While the congregationally organized churches lacking denominational channels might conceivably, in democratic fashion, ally themselves in some sort of organization through which they could achieve representation as a family of churches, such an attempt would not be satisfactory. It would only result in having local churches feel so remote from the Council that any sense of vital participation would be lacking. He also envisioned the possibility that some world confessional organizations might adopt a stand adverse to membership in the Council thus excluding from the Council some of the smaller church bodies genuinely desiring to participate. Finally, he warned that a Christendom long plagued with an overconsciousness of theological differences would unnecessarily be focusing attention upon disagreements about which many Christians had heretofore not been particularly sensitive.[21]

There was fear that confessional representation would lead to an undesirable perpetuation of denominational differences. It was with evident approval that Dr. Van Dusen quoted a spokesman at the Madras Conference: "We of the Younger Churches see no need for your damnations--I mean denominations.[22]

Dr. A. L. Warnshuis warned against the developing of denominational blocs in the Council. He held that while some doctrinal differences do indeed remain, such differences are sufficiently well defined that there is no need for confessional blocs to safeguard differing heritages of faith. Calling attention to the World Council's great task of trying to harmonize differences arising from national viewpoints and prejudices he was of the opinion that such "cultural and traditional differences" would be the practical realities with which the Council would have to wrestle. He stressed the basic importance of national or area councils of churches in any effective functioning of the World Council. Since meetings on a world scale would be held only at long intervals and attended only by a few individuals, and with annual meetings of the Central Committee limited to a still smaller number of people mainly from the larger churches, a primary role would be played by the area organizations. In the area organizations, into which the member churches would of necessity have to associate in order to arrange for representation in meetings of the World Council, representatives of the churches would be able to counsel together at regular intervals, perhaps as frequently as every two or three months. Subjects of concern to the World Council would be considered at these area meetings, thus making possible a better understanding of the issues by the constituting church bodies and resulting in a closer relationship of the churches to the concerns of the world organization. Indeed the very nature of the World Council, as a fellowship of churches, required that it function primarily through the area councils. The frequent association of representatives of the various churches would help make the WCC truly a fellowship of churches and not just a formal organization. Concluded Dr. Warnshuis:

> A world fellowship--not merely a world council--of Churches is what we want. It is a World Council OF the Churches,--not a World Council _for_ the Churches,--that we are trying to develop. When the Churches begin to think and work with others as members of a world fellowship, then the World Council will live. The Council is not an end in itself, but it is a means to accomplish the purpose of aiding the Churches to counsel together. International committees and meetings for counselling are needed in order to co-ordinate and to stimulate mutually the action of the Churches. But regional meetings are of primary importance in order that Churches, members of the world fellowship, who are located in the same areas can meet frequently for conference regarding the issues and interests of the whole world-wide fellowship. The Council is not some super-organization. The Council is the fellowship of Churches who choose to join it and who purpose to counsel together about the interests of the universal church.[23]

While Lutherans were in agreement with Warnshuis that the World Council should in fact be a fellowship of churches existing for the purpose of deliberation and counsel, his suggestion that "cultural and traditional differences" would be the most important practical realities with which it would have to wrestle was completely unacceptable. It was this very tendency to stress social questions as being more important than doctrinal convictions that made the Lutheran churches feel the need for having the Council organized along confessional lines.

E. Endorsement of American Lutheran Petition by the LWC

At the March 22, 1946 meeting of the American Section, held in Chicago, it was voted that a communication be sent to all Lutheran churches of the world informing them of the American Lutheran view on confessional representation and requesting them to join in a united approach to the World Council.[24]

Wentz initiated the process for implementing this action by drawing up a brief statement to be signed by all Lutheran bodies of America adhering to the LWC.[25] On April 8 a first draft was sent to the other three American members of the Executive Committee for their criticism and suggestion.[26] Following a conference with Fry and Long on April 15 a longer letter was prepared. After completing all necessary preliminary arrangements the communication was sent out by Dr. Long on May 4 together with a copy of the petition as presented at Geneva, a copy of the World Council constitution and a leaflet describing the Council and its operations.[27]

Responses to the communication were nearly all favorable. On June 17 Dr. J. J. Stolz, president of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia wrote Archbishop Eidem expressing hearty approval of the American Lutheran proposal. It was his judgment that only if the Council constitution were thus changed would the Lutheran Church be assured representation commensurate with its numerical strength. More important still would be the greater effectiveness of the Lutheran witness. The danger that convictions of Christian conscience might be overriden and divine truth looked upon as relative would be averted if representation were along confessional lines.[28] Dr. J. P. van Heest, president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Netherlands, reported his church's decision to join in the American Lutheran petition. He warned that if a change were not made the contribution of the minority Lutheran churches would be largely lost in the World Council. To illustrate the way such churches tend to be ignored he cited a recent incident involving his own church. When a representative of the Church of Sweden had come to Holland Lutheran leaders had received no information of his coming visit and the Swedish churchman's contacts had been exclusively with representatives of the Dutch Reformed Church.[29] Bishop elect F. H. P. Wheatcroft of the Evangelical Church of France wrote on July 1 that both synods of his church had decided to adhere to the petition submitted to the World Council by Dr. Wentz and forwarded to them in behalf of the American Section by Dr. Long.[30] On July 10 Bishop Jan Szeruda reported that the Consistory of the Evangelical Church in Poland fully supported the initiative to the Provisional Committee as outlined in the May 4, 1946 letter of Long and the address and letter of Wentz. Noting that his church had participated in ecumenical conferences since 1925 and that it had already joined the World Council prior to the outbreak of the war, Bishop Szeruda expressed the judgment that acceptance of the denominational principle would strengthen the Polish Lutheran Church's place among the "fraternal Christian churches, especially the Lutheran ones."[31]

When the American Lutheran proposal came up for consideration at the July 24-26, 1946 meeting of the LWC Executive Committee at Uppsala Wentz outlined the reasons for the petition.[32] He emphasized the common evangelical testimony which Lutherans have to bear before the world. Unity among them rests on a common acceptance of the Lutheran confessions. He warned that the evangelical witness so much needed in the World Council would be eclipsed if representation were established on a territorial rather than on a confessional basis. While the Lutheran Church is the majority church in Scandinavian countries it is in the minority in America and other lands.

The arguments of the Lutheran churches of America in regard to confessional representation were pointedly summarized by Dr. Fry:

> 1. As sincere friends of the World Council of Churches, we vigorously favor grounding it on the strongest possible foundation. The really effective bonds which unite Christians are not primarily those of nationality or culture but those of a common faith. The World Council will need the most powerful adhesive it can find. Nationalism, far from being a legitimate standard for a World Council of Churches, has proved that it can be the most insidious enemy of Christianity. How paradoxical it would be if the World Council were to encourage a fusion of Churches on a nationalistic basis in Germany, for instance,--of all places!
>
> 2. We American Lutherans are reluctantly aware that not all the Protestants of our continent are evangelical Christians. We would be distinctly uncomfortable in sitting down with elements or individuals that are Unitarian in theology in a regional electoral assembly of the World Council. It would be unnatural for American churchmen with negative doctrinal leanings to allocate seats in a council of Churches to us or for us to allocate seats to them. Both our affection and our confidence link us with our confessional brethren rather than with our physical neighbors.
>
> 3. Every minority Lutheran Church which has reported its views on this issue--in Holland, France, Poland, Hungary, Australia--has declared in favor of confessional representation. One and all will feel a firmer security with this guarantee. Even in the distribution of relief, the predominant Reformed Churches in some countries in Europe have seemed insatiable. The rights of the outnumbered Lutheran Churches have been slighted or eclipsed. May this not happen again in the allocation of seats in

the World Council if it is to be by nations or continents and not by confessions?[33]

A communication from Berggrav suggested some possible objections to the American Lutheran proposal. He raised the question whether Lutherans in America and elsewhere would not thus gain their representation at the expense of the Lutheran churches in Scandinavia. Also, he expressed apprehension lest the channeling of the Lutheran witness through one route would tend to obliterate breadth of viewpoint and thus actually impoverish the Lutheran testimony in the World Council. He suggested that Lutherans might have a stronger voice "as a chorus than as a solo." He voiced opposition to "bloc building" by a confessional group, convinced that such a development would be destructive to the Christian unity being sought.[34]

In answer to objections raised by Berggrav Wentz pointed out that the proposed action would not prevent any Lutheran church from electing representation on a geographical basis should that be preferred. The LWC Executive Committee was only being asked to help secure representation along confessional lines for those Lutheran bodies of the world desiring thus to be represented.[35]

Noting that the American Lutheran petition was in some quarters mistakenly viewed as a request for LWC membership in the World Council Dr. Fry made it clear that such an arrangement was neither contemplated nor desired. It only asked that a proportionate number of seats be reserved for the Lutheran churches of the world and that these churches be permitted to have the LWC serve as allocating agent for distributing such seats among the individual bodies. Only the churches themselves would be members of the World Council and each church would name its own delegates.[36]

The Lutheran witness in the World Council would not be impoverished as Bishop Berggrav feared, nor would breadth of viewpoint be obliterated since each Lutheran body would retain full freedom of expression. Nor would a united Lutheran approach to the Council constitute bloc building contrary to the ecumenical spirit. The real peril in a world wrecked by nationalistic conflict is the formation of national blocs rather than confessional or ecclesiastical alignments on a voluntary and consultative basis. Surely the spirit of militant nationalism should not be nurtured by the church.[37]

After the position of the Lutheran churches of America had been related at some length and objections to their proposal answered, Archbishop Eidem declared: "We had not completely understood before. ... Our misgivings rested on misunderstanding."[38] He added that Bishop Berggrav also had misunderstood the significance of the American proposal. From the explanations given it was now clear that "bloc building," against which the Norwegian Primate had mainly objected, was not involved at all. Eidem further observed that he himself actually felt much more at home among Lutherans than he did in the geographically constituted Continental Section of the World Council.[39] Indicating a deep desire to have all Lutheran churches of America participate in the World Council the LWC president asked what influence the proposed change in constitution would have on their entry. Aasgaard replied that the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America would probably not join unless the change were made. If representation would be along confessional lines possibly all but one of the Lutheran groups in America would affiliate.[40] In response to a further appeal by Fry that the LWC Executive Committee support the American proposal and recommend it to all Lutheran churches of the world Eidem replied:

> We of the northern countries are willing to recommend this proposal with gladness to our brethren and to our Churches. This is not just a gesture of compliance. We agreed because it is right and expedient.[41]

Others at the meeting also expressed hearty approval. Said Dr. Jorgensen of Denmark, "We must support the American brethren. 'The strong must support the weak' and this is a case. It will not be merely charity but right and wise." Bishop Rodhe indicated he too was now in favor of the proposal and would uphold it before the Swedish bishops. Dr. Olaf Moe of Norway joined in the endorsement, adding that he thought Bishop Berggrav would now understand the real significance of the American petition and rally behind it. Finnish Bishop Bonsdorff admitted that until now he had not been clear on the matter. Noting Archbishop Lehtonen's favorable attitude, even earlier, he stated that he himself now also gave full assent. Approval of the proposal would result in stronger Lutheran representation in the World Council. He added that he would be sorry to see the Lutheran churches of America fail to participate in the Council as Dr. Aasgaard had indicated would probably be the case if representation were continued on a geographical basis.[42]

When a vote was finally taken it was unanimously agreed to "support the petition of the American Lutheran Churches--and recommend it to the Committee on Arrangements of the World Council for favorable action."[43]

F. Horsham Meeting of the WCC Committee on Arrangements

The Committee on Arrangements for the First Assembly met at St. Julians, Horsham, England July 31 and August 1, 1946.[44] After giving attention to the place and date of the First Assembly, its program, methods of procedure, worship arrangements, receptions and public meetings, the matter of representation came up for consideration.

When Dr. Visser 't Hooft noted that it had not been determined at Utrecht whether every member church should have a seat in the Assembly Dr. Koechlin expressed the opinion that the constitutional provision "The Assembly shall be composed of official representatives of the Churches or groups of Churches" carried with it the suggestion that some might be only indirectly represented. It was agreed, however, that at the first meeting every member church should have at least one delegate.[45]

Turning next to the method of allocating seats to the member churches it was proposed that in North America this be done through the American and Canadian committees for the World Council and in Great Britain through the British Council of Churches. Those attending the 1947 meeting of the International Missionary Council should be asked to make a suggested allocation for the Younger Churches. Arrangements for the churches on the European continent would need to be further discussed.[46]

Van Dusen stated that the relationship of the Provisional Committee would have to be with individual churches through regional units of some kind. He added, however, that there would be nothing to prevent a group of churches from joining with another group to choose a block of representatives. Should, for example, the Lutheran churches of America want to choose non-American Lutherans to represent them they probably had the power to do so. Bishop Neill disagreed with this interpretation of the provisional constitution, insisting that the general principle was quite clear, namely that representation was to be territorial.[47]

It was at this point that Wentz urged as an alternative the method of confessional representation. He suggested that of the 110 representatives allowed the churches on the continent of Europe those desiring representation on a confessional basis be assigned a certain number of seats. Neill replied that the allocation of seats in the First Assembly would have to be territorial in keeping with provisions of the constitution approved at Utrecht. He pointed out that the question actually before the Committee on Arrangements was whether or not an amendment should be proposed to the Assembly in regard to the basis of representation.

Dr. Wentz, speaking in behalf of the Lutheran churches of the world, asked if a simple amendment could not be made to Article V of the constitution which would permit Lutheran churches to be represented on a confessional basis. He proposed that after reference to the Orthodox churches there be inserted a paragraph providing for "so many representing the Lutheran Churches adhering to the Lutheran World Federation, allocated in such a manner as they may decide."[48] In the long discussion which followed Wentz explained the American Lutheran petition, noting that it now constituted a request from practically all Lutheran churches of the world.

Dr. Cavert, chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, suggested three possibilities: (1) that Lutherans be granted permission to be represented on the same basis as the Orthodox with no further change in the constitution, (2) that the territorial basis be abandoned entirely in favor of confessional representation, or (3) that there be a combination of the two methods which would permit churches to go in on either basis, as they might choose.[49]

Visser 't Hooft was opposed to any alteration of arrangements already in effect. As long as Lutheran churches would have delegates of their own choosing at the Assembly he could not see that it made any difference how they got there. Bishop Neill warned that if a new basis were granted to Lutherans the other churches would have to reconsider their position and the category of Younger Churches would have to be dissolved into confessional groupings. Adoption of the proposed amendment would in a sense alter the entire form of the WCC as envisioned at Utrecht and presented to the world. Under terms of the provisional constitution the member churches were prepared to regard themselves as One Church and the method of representation merely as a matter of convenience. In contrast to this any procedure requiring the churches to say "We are the Anglican Church, the Lutheran Church, the Orthodox Church and so on," would constitute a segregation of them into confessional blocs. Mrs. Kathleen Bliss expressed opposition on the grounds that a denominational consciousness at the local level would be perpetuated and people would not be inclined to cooperate with other churches in their home towns feeling their ecumenical responsibility was being fulfilled merely by having membership in the World Council. Dr. Wentz replied that he could not agree that ecumenicity meant the dissolving of denominational boundaries. Dr. Leiper indicated that he was inclined to favor the confessional method since it would get away from nationalism and help the churches grow together as they approached one another always on a world level.[50]

Dr. Cavert finally suggested that Article V be completely rewritten so that it might read somewhat as follows:

> Seats in the World Council Assembly shall be allocated to the member Churches by the Central Committee, due regard being had to such factors as numerical size, adequate confessional representation and adequate geographical representation.[51]

Calling attention to its emphasis on a direct relationship between the Assembly and the member churches the chairman asked whether his alternative proposal would be acceptable to the Lutheran churches. Dr. Wentz replied in the affirmative. Minutes of the meeting report thus on the subsequent action by the Committee on Arrangements:

> It was finally agreed to recommend that the following amendment to Article V should be submitted for consideration:

> 'Seats in the Assembly shall be allocated by the Central Committee to the member Churches, due regard being given to such factors as numerical size, adequate confessional representation and adequate geographical distribution. Suggestions for readjustment in allocation of seats may be made to the Central Committee by member Churches or by groups of Churches, - confessional, regional or international, - and these shall become effective if approved by the Central Committee and the member Churches concerned.'

> The following amendment should also be suggested in regard to paragraph (ii) of Article V, as follows:

> 'Seats in the Central Committee shall be allocated by the Assembly, due regard being given to such factors as numerical size, adequate confessional representation and adequate geographical distribution. Suggestions for changes in the composition of the Committee may be made by member Churches or by groups of Churches, - confessional, regional or international.'[52]

The same day that the above agreement was reached Dr. Wentz sent the following telegram to Dr. Michelfelder, who at Uppsala had been elected executive secretary of the LWF: "ARTICLE FIVE MODIFIED BY OMITTING REFERENCE TO ALL GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS AND PROVIDING DIRECT ALLOCATION TO MEMBER CHURCHES AFTER CONSULTATION WITH CONFESSIONAL GROUPS. ..."[53] On August 5 he wrote to LWF president, Eidem, reporting the Horsham action. The Swedish primate replied immediately expressing gratification over Dr. Wentz's successful efforts "as champion of confession in the representation for Churches and groups of Churches which want such an arrangement," and over the fact that the amendment as now being proposed had been unanimously agreed upon. He hoped it would be acceptable to the Lutheran churches of America. Noting Bishop Brilioth's earlier opposition to the American petition, especially its suggestion that Lutherans along with the Orthodox should be expressly mentioned in the WCC constitution, Eidem thought the amendment as approved at Horsham would be more acceptable.[54]

Following the agreement reached on August 1, 1946 it was still necessary for the proposed change in constitution to be approved by the Provisional Committee before an amendment could be submitted for consideration by the Amsterdam Assembly. Such approval was readily given at the Committee's next meeting held at Buck Hill Falls, Pennsylvania, April 22-25, 1947.[55]

CHAPTER IX

AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCHES AFFILIATING WITH THE WORLD COUNCIL AFTER APPROVAL OF THE HORSHAM AMENDMENT

A. The United Lutheran Church

Even after the August 1, 1946 action by the Committee on Arrangements it was still not certain that the ULCA would accept membership in the World Council. Dr. Fry was of the opinion that the compromise amendment did not actually fulfill the conditions requested in the LWC petition. Dr. Wentz felt that the intention of the petition had been carried out and that the ULCA could properly affiliate on the basis of authorization given at Louisville in 1942. Fry agreed that it would be wise to proceed. To have the ULCA and possibly the ALC take official action at their forthcoming conventions stating they would accept membership in the WCC provided the amendment was adopted might help insure its approval by the Amsterdam Assembly.[1] Without any reference to the merits of the Horsham proposal the 1946 convention voted to give the Executive Board power to take whatever steps were necessary "to complete the membership of the ULCA in the World Council of Churches in conformity with the conditions specified in our application."[2] It was not until nearly a year later, on October 8, 1947, that the Board took final action accepting

Council membership.[3] At the same meeting the Board voiced objection to plans announced by the WCC's provisional Youth Department according to which members would be selected along geographical lines without going through church channels. A resolution was adopted instructing the ULCA delegates to Amsterdam to push for full application of the principle of church representation in the setting up of all departments of the World Council.[4] It was agreed that the church's commission on Faith and Order would be terminated at the time of the First Assembly since from then on representatives to the Council would continue the ULCA's interest in the objectives of the movement.[5] At the Board's October 1947 and January and April 1948 meetings delegates, alternates and accredited visitors to Amsterdam were appointed.[6] "In the expectation that the ULCA will have the right to designate a member of this Central Committee" Fry was nominated for possible consideration by the Assembly.[7] Clarence Stoughton was named as the Board's choice in the event the church would be asked to designate a lay member of the Committee.[8]

B. The American Lutheran Church

The ALC Executive Committee on September 7, 1945 voted to accept membership in the World Council provided that the Lutheran churches of the world might be represented on a confessional rather than on a geographical basis.[9] Their action came the day after the Columbus meeting of Lutheran leaders which agreed to petition for an amendment to the Council's constitution. On October 17 the Committee enlarged the resolution adopted earlier and in the following form sent it to the WCC's Geneva office:

> RESOLUTION REGARDING WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
>
> Whereas, the American Lutheran Church at its 1944 Convention authorized its Executive Committee 'to give careful study to this matter, and to enter into such relationship as it may deem necessary, provided however that the confessional position of the American Lutheran Church is not violated;' and
>
> Whereas, the Executive Committee has carefully studied material dealing with the proposed constitution and principles of operation of the World Council of Churches, and is satisfied that membership in the World Council will not violate or compromise the confessional position of the American Lutheran Church; and
>
> Whereas, we are convinced that Lutheran representation in the Assembly and on the Central Committee of the World Council should be on a confessional rather than a geographical basis, implemented through the Lutheran World Convention; THEREFORE
>
> BE IT RESOLVED:
>
> A. That the Executive Committee of the American Lutheran Church, in the name of the American Lutheran Church, hereby petitions the Provisional Central Committee of the World Council of Churches in process of formation to effect such amendment of the provisional constitution as will provide for Lutheran representation in the Assembly and on the Central Committee on a confessional basis; and
>
> B. That the Executive Committee of the American Lutheran Church, in the name of the American Lutheran Church, hereby declares our readiness to accept the

> invitation to become a member of the World Council of Churches now in process of formation, on condition that the provisional constitution of the World Council is so amended as to provide for Lutheran representation on a confessional basis.
>
> This action taken at a meeting on Sept. 7, 1945, and confirmed at a meeting on Oct. 17, 1945. (Signed) H. L. Yochum, Secretary.[10]

A copy of the resolution having been sent also to the WCC's New York office, Dr. Leiper wrote Yochum and Poppen expressing gratification over the reported action. He was confident that it would be possible to accomplish the desired change inasmuch as the principle of confessional representation had in fact already been recognized in the case of the Orthodox Church. He added, however, that there would be no possibility of legally revising the constitution until the first meeting of the Assembly.[11]

The 1946 ALC convention voted to approve the 1945 action of its Executive Committee.[12] On May 28, 1947 Leiper notified the chairman of the Council's Allocation Committee for America, Dr. Wentz, that the ALC as well as the UELC had completed official action accepting membership and that accordingly seats in the Assembly would need to be allocated to them.[13] Having been allowed two seats the ALC Executive Committee authorized and requested President Poppen to appoint one clerical and one lay delegate.[14] Dr. Long and Mr. Martin C. Ewald were subsequently named. Following the former's death on February 19, 1948 Dr. Harold L. Yochum, president of Capital University in Columbus, Ohio, was appointed to go in his place.[15]

C. The United Evangelical Lutheran Church

The UELC, until 1946 known as the United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church, at first declined participation in the World Council. On January 19, 1938 President N. C. Carlsen wrote as follows to Dr. Leiper:

> As much as we appreciate the invitation to join the World Council of Churches, we are not at this time ready to join this movement. Being one of the smaller bodies of the Lutheran Church in America, we would rather bide the time for a while. We would like to see representation on the Central Committee along denominational lines. Until the Lutheran Church and any other church is assured direct representation we are not particularly interested in membership.[16]

This early emphasis on confessional representation was renewed when Dr. Carlsen joined in the Lutheran petition drawn up on September 6, 1945. Encouraged by the prospect that the WCC constitution might be changed he subsequently urged Lutheran participation in the new organization so that their witness might receive a hearing.[17] The UELC's Church Council also recommended to the June 1946 convention that membership be accepted. The delegates were not yet ready for definite action. Instead, a motion prevailed "that this matter be tabled until the next convention, and be carefully studied by the Church Council."[18]

To the 1947 convention President Carlsen pointed out that membership would not involve altar and pulpit fellowship nor would it imply a yielding of confessions, practices and principles by any of the participating churches, but rather that it offered an opportunity for cooperation as far as each member might accept the responsibility. He urged that the UELC affiliate without further delay.[19] A similar recommendation was brought in by the Church Council. While there were a few efforts on the floor of the convention to defeat the proposal or to have it tabled again the final vote taken June 26 was overwhelmingly in favor of membership. Only two negative votes were registered.[20] Three weeks later Carlsen notified Leiper of his church's action:

> This is to notify you that the United Evangelical Lutheran Church decided to join the World Council of Churches by adopting the following resolutions:
>
> Whereas, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church has been invited to join the World Council of Churches,
>
> Whereas, the Council is merely a fellowship of churches with no legislative powers over the participating bodies and can act for them only as far as any or all of them have commissioned it do do so,
>
> Whereas, membership in the Council does not imply altar and pulpit fellowship,
>
> Whereas, there is a crying need of Christians to meet the onslaught of the forces of unbelief and ungodliness with a united front,
>
> Whereas, the Council affords an opportunity for the Lutheran voice to be heard and its influence felt to the end 'That they may all be one' (Joh. 17,21).

> Whereas, our Lutheran Brethren in Northern Europe as well as several Lutheran bodies in America are already active in the formation of the Council, and
>
> Whereas, much of the relief for our distressed brethren must be distributed through the Council
>
> BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the United Evangelical Lutheran Church joins the World Council of Churches and authorizes its Church Council to implement this action, provided the representation in the assembly and central committee shall be on a confessional and not geographical basis as far as the Lutherans are concerned, and that if and when this condition is satisfactorily met, the Church Council be authorized on behalf of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church to accept membership in the proposed World Council of Churches.[21]

D. The Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church

It was also in June 1947 that the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church, since 1952 the American Evangelical Lutheran Church, took final action authorizing affiliation with the World Council.

The invitation to join the Council first came before the church at its 1939 convention. At that time a motion was passed that "We receive the invitation to join." Nothing further was done for some years to come.[22] Meanwhile, however, contact was maintained between the church and American officials of the World Council. On May 19, 1941 President Alfred Jensen acknowledged an invitation from Leiper to send representatives to the forthcoming North American Ecumenical Conference to be held in Toronto the following month.

Expressing regret that it would be impossible to attend the meeting, Jensen in his letter of reply extended an invitation to Leiper to address the 1941 DELC convention on conditions in Europe or on "whatever phase of the ecumenical movement which he might choose." The latter accepted and on June 27, 1941 addressed the Troy, New York convention on "The Church Confronting World Crisis."[23]

In October 1944 Leiper mailed Jensen a formal invitation asking the DELC to accept Council membership. In addition a copy of the provisional constitution, a letter covering the conditions of membership, and a booklet on the Council's program of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid were included.[24] No immediate action was to be forthcoming. The following September Jensen represented his church at the Columbus meeting of American Lutheran leaders and joined in the petition there drawn up.[25] Later in the year the church's Synodical Board approved a resolution urging the 1946 convention to accept membership provided that representation could be on a confessional basis for the Lutherans of the world.[26] Jensen reported at the 1946 convention on recent ecumenical developments, noting the Lutheran petition and emphasizing especial- the central role of the World Council in the coordinating of relief and rehabilitation work in Central Europe's devastated areas.[27] Another year was to pass before the DELC voted to authorize its Board of Directors to affiliate. Implementing action by the Board was completed five months later and in late November 1947 the church's official application for membership forwarded to Visser 't Hooft.[28]

E. The Augustana Synod

Although Augustana had unconditionally accepted membership five years prior to the Columbus meeting it shared the convictions there expressed and joined the other petitioners in pushing for confessional representation. On October 15, 1945 President Bersell wrote encouragingly to Leiper noting that the churches uniting in the petition would probably all affiliate provided the WCC constitution were amended. In his reply the latter stated that it was his judgment and that of Cavert that there was no objection in principle to the change being sought by the Lutheran churches of America. He went on to add, however, that it would be extremely awkward if the Lutherans were to insist that all churches must be represented along confessional lines since technical arrangements prevailed among some of them which would make it impossible to proceed in such a manner. As far as the Lutherans themselves were concerned there seemed to be no insuperable barrier, especially since the Orthodox churches were already on a confessional basis. While the problem could no doubt be worked out it would not be possible to do so prior to the First Assembly at which time the whole question of constitution would be up for consideration. He suggested that the matter might be discussed to advantage at the forthcoming meeting of the Provisional Committee and expressed hope that Bersell might be present at Geneva.[29] He did subsequently attend in the capacity of an invited temporary alternate.[30]

When the Committee met at Buck Hill Falls in April 1947 it was largely at the insistence of the Augustana Synod president that an important statement on the nature and objectives of the WCC was drawn up in which it was pointedly disavowed that the Council had any intention of becoming a world church dominated by a central administrative authority. Following the report of Visser 't Hooft, in which he had declared that the World Council was in no sense a super-church but "the servant of its member-churches for purposes of co-operation and unity," and had emphasized that it was "a specialized ecumenical agency which is constantly available to the churches for the performing of common tasks," Bersell suggested that the Provisional Committee issue an official statement clearly outlining the honest intention, purpose and proposed scope of the Council. This was desirable in view of the inclination in certain fundamentalist quarters to misinterpret and misrepresent the nature and aims of the new world organization. He cited a report from a recent meeting of the National Association of Evangelicals in which an unnamed Council official was quoted to the effect that its eventual goal was that of becoming a super-church.

Bishop Oxnam asked that the real meaning of Bersell's proposal be carefully considered. While the General Secretary had indeed made it clear that the World Council does not contemplate becoming a super-church, his report had also looked forward to the day when there would be one church of Christ on earth. Oxnam warned that a statement such as proposed by Bersell must not give away the great goal toward which it was hoped the Council would move. Dr. John Mackay agreed with the Augustana president that it should be made clear to everyone that the WCC was not moving toward "a Romanized Protestantism" and that it did not have before its eyes "the ideal of a single ecclesiastical unit, whose chief officers would ecclesiastically and theologically control the whole church structure."[31] Dr. Wentz also strongly supported Bersell's position.[32] The Sub-Committee on Resolutions and Pronouncements[33] brought in a statement which was unanimously adopted by the Provisional Committee and subsequently, in slightly revised form, by the Amsterdam Assembly.[34]

F. American Lutherans Contribute to Ecumenical Emphasis of LWF

At the 1946 meeting of the LWC Executive Committee it was agreed that a Lutheran World Federation be formed as successor to the Lutheran World Convention.[35] A constitution prepared by a special committee consisting of the American Section under the chairmanship of Wentz was approved by the Lund Assembly on July 1, 1947. Article III provided that one of the purposes of the LWF was "To achieve a united approach to ecumenical Christian movements ..."[36] At Lund this article was amended to indicate an even more positive emphasis so that the constitution now states that the Federation is "To foster Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements."[37]

Dr. Long in his keynote address to the Lund Assembly stressed the importance of Lutheran participation in the WCC, at the same time calling for a strong confessional consciousness as being in the best interest of true ecumenicity. In reply to those who warned that confessional organizations would militate against the ecumenical movement he pointed out that practically all member churches of the LWF had already signified their intention of uniting with the World Council. He held that the Council would be a better balanced organization if it had strong confessional groups within its ranks than would be the case if it were made up only of those who have little regard for confessional standards. The promotion of proper respect for the views and convictions of all the churches would best be accomplished by having each denomination present a united front. In his opinion it was those opposing the consolidation of churches of the same faith who were not truly ecumenical since they were seeking by a syncretic process to amalgamate all Protestant faiths by ignoring confessional differences. Concluded Dr. Long:

> We are definitely in favor of the ecumenical progress that has been made and we want it to result in the strongest organization possible. This can result only from real honesty and a genuine purpose to cultivate a due respect for the right of each communion to adhere to and propagate its own confession. Through a common approach and a united front the Lutheran Church will be able to make a positive and worth-while contribution to this world-wide movement of evangelical churches. ... We must join hands with our Christian brothers in other evangelical churches to bring healing to all the world.[38]

Dr. Michelfelder, in his report as executive secretary, called upon the Lutheran churches of the world to realize their responsibility in ecumenical efforts. He warned that Lutherans can no longer live in isolation without regard for fellow-believers in other denominations. "God has worked wonders of regeneration through other church bodies as well as through our own."[39] In his opinion Lutherans could best make their contribution through a renewed confessionalism which emphasizes the central importance of convictions of faith.[40]

CHAPTER X

COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP REJECTED

A. Introduction

Of the eight Lutheran churches of America which joined in the September 1946 petition for confessional representation three failed to move on to membership in the World Council. They were the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Free Church and the Suomi Synod. While the last named had two representatives present at the Columbus meeting it took no further action of any kind with reference to the WCC.[1] The Evangelical Lutheran Church on June 11, 1948 decisively rejected a proposal to affiliate. On the very same day similar action was taken by the Lutheran Free Church.

B. The Lutheran Free Church

The Lutheran Free Church at an early time established contact with the developing ecumenical movement. At the 1910 Edinburgh Conference its Board of Missions was represented by Professor J. H. Blegen.[2] Pastor O. H. Sletten was present at Stockholm in 1925[3] while at Lausanne two years later Pastor T. O. Burntvedt, later president of his church, was in attendance.[4] Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 68 published in October 1932 lists Burntvedt as a co-opted member.[5] At the Edinburgh

Conference in 1937, however, it was completely unrepresented, not even a fraternal visitor being designated. Interest in ecumenical deliberations was renewed during and after the war so that President Burntvedt readily responded to the invitation to join in the all-Lutheran petition in the expectation that his church would affiliate with the World Council if representation were established along confessional lines. He reported on developments to the 1946 LFC annual conference and suggested that while it might not yet be ready to proceed attention was being called to the WCC in the hope that favorable action might be taken some time later.[6] The church's Board of Organization recommended that membership be approved.[7] But a motion prevailed that action on joining the Council be delayed "until more information about it has been disseminated among our people through our church papers."[8]

Not much of the desired information was to appear in the Lutheran Messenger during the ensuing year. During that whole time only two articles were published touching on the matter. The first of these was an editorial published on May 6, 1947, only a short time before the convening of the next annual conference. In it Pastor Sverre Torgerson, LFC secretary as well as editor of the church's paper, urged affiliation.

> Because of its loyalty to the Word and its clear presentation of the Gospel message the Lutheran Church holds a strategic position in Christendom. We do not think it can fulfill its mission by a policy of isolation. It need not lose its identity or compromise its

> position by joining hands with other Christians in bringing the message of Christ to the world.[9]

The second article was by Dr. Bernhard Christensen, president of Augsburg College and Seminary. In support of Council membership he directed attention to one of the basic principles of the LFC, namely, "that larger organizations shall not hinder or control the spiritual program of the smaller units," noting that this principle was especially compatible with participation in the WCC. He stressed also the importance of the doctrine of the Una Sancta and the need for giving practical recognition to the essential unity of the church.[10]

At the 1947 annual conference Burntvedt expressed concern over the fact that so little had appeared in the church's paper in regard to the Council, especially since action had been postponed the year before pending the dissemination of more information.[11] When a recommendation that the LFC join the World Council was again brought forward a motion prevailed that a decision be delayed another year.[12] Some delegates felt adequate information was still lacking. Others opposed membership on the ground that the "unsound doctrinal positions" of churches already in the Council would be harmful to their church.

A somewhat more extensive treatment was given the matter in the Lutheran Messenger during the year that followed. Pastor Richard Knudsen, a former army chaplain, urged that

Lutherans be willing to share with all Christendom the distinctive contribution which they have to offer. He felt they would constitute a wholesome conservative influence "in applying the brakes on a would-be runaway political ecclesiasticism," and help control "tendencies in the World Council to fly off on premature tangents." On the negative side he was critical of the inclination to minimize the importance of doctrinal considerations and expressed doubt that in the "ecclesiastical Babel" of the Council "a clear, unanimous Word of God" would likely receive a hearing.[13]

Pastor Torgerson in a brief editorial appearing on May 4, 1948 cited the following reasons "Why Lutherans go to Amsterdam."

> Lutherans go to Amsterdam to bear witness to their faith. They go there with open eyes, mindful of their privilege and of their responsibility.
>
> In humble recognition of the grace of God who has preserved to them their precious spiritual heritage, and in gratitude to Him they want to share with others the most holy Gospel of God's love and grace.
>
> Lutherans go to Amsterdam not only to give, but also to receive. Confessing faith in One Holy Christian Church, they believe it is right to find a common ground on which Christians in the various branches of the Church Universal can meet together and converse together.
>
> Lutherans go to Amsterdam because it was the sense of the Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation at Lund last year that the Lutheran Church should seek closer fellowship with other Christian communions. According to the constitution of the L.W.F. one of its purposes is "To foster Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements." ...[14]

The same issue of the Lutheran Messenger carried an article against Council membership entitled "A New World Religion and a New World Church." Calling attention to a forthcoming congress of religions which was to be held at New York by representatives of the leading religions of the world, Pastor Laurhammer drew a parallel between the syncretistic efforts in behalf of "a new world religion" and what he considered to be the efforts of modernist leaders in the World Council to establish "a new world church." He bitterly denounced modernism as dishonest, hiding its anti-Christian teaching under orthodox terminology. He warned against the financial burden that would result from membership in a World Council in which the church would carry no influence and from which it had nothing to gain. While he himself had been at Edinburgh in 1910 and at Stockholm in 1925 he suggested that rather than "going to Holland" in an effort to promote Christian unity it would be better to have the LFC "begin in America" by seeking closer relations with fellow Lutherans of Norwegian extraction.[15]

Taking note of the Lutheran Free Church's emphasis on congregational authority Miss Minnie Raaum warned that the WCC would eventually become a "Protestant Papacy" with which her church could have nothing to do. She denounced the World Council also because of its "modernist" leadership. Its doctrinal basis she held to be meaningless since the Biblical terms employed were readily subject to varied interpretations not at all in keeping with the real meaning of Scripture. Convinced that some within the Council denied the fundamental truths of the Gospel she suggested that such members of other denominations could not even be considered as fellow Christians.[16]

Dr. Christensen continued to push for affiliation with the Council. He regarded its doctrinal basis as an affirmation of faith in the Incarnation, the heart of the Christian Gospel. While admitting there were theological liberals in places of leadership he was convinced that the masses of the people in the member churches were orthodox in outlook and faith, noting further that the WCC was primarily a gathering of Christian churches rather than a union of church leaders. Admission of churches on a confessional basis would give adequate assurance that membership would not involve compromising unionism. Nor was it to be a super-church. Instead it would provide the churches a medium for consultation, deliberation and recommendation, serving both as a symbol and an organ for united action. He stressed the need for a united Christian witness in a world where "the forces of secularism have grown bold and powerful in the councils of men and nations." While important differences indeed exist between the denominations the points of agreement are even more deep-going. As long as tensions and conflicts continue between the Christian churches how can there be expected to be any lessening of tensions between men and nations. Lutherans should join the Council both because they have something to contribute and have much to learn from the other churches. Participation would provide a sense of larger fellowship and added spiritual strength and inspiration. Concluded Christensen:

> If the evangelical and conservative churches enter into its activities in this spirit, the World Council can by the grace of God become both a great arena for contending for the purity of the Faith once delivered, and a strong citadel of the Spirit where Christians of many communions may together humbly await a new enduement of Pentecostal power adequate for the tasks of this historic time.[17]

In his message to the 1948 annual conference President Burntvedt urged that definite action be taken on the proposal to join the Council especially since a decision had already twice been postponed.[18] Spirited debate and considerable parliamentary maneuvering preceded the final vote. Before discussion on the resolution carried over from the previous year opened on Thursday afternoon, June 10th, it was agreed that a two-thirds vote should be required for a favorable decision. Immediately Pastor A. Oftedal moved that the resolution to affiliate be postponed indefinitely. Pastor Clarence

Carlson spoke against such postponement after which M. E. Helland moved that the motion to postpone be tabled, which motion carried. Oftedal then proposed a substitute resolution: "The Annual Conference recommends to the congregations of the Lutheran Free Church that they join the World Council of Churches," to take the place of the one carried over from 1947 which read: "The Conference recommends that we join the World Council of Churches." Following speeches on the substitute by Mr. Henry Quanbeck and Pastor D. W. Lyngdal, Pastor John Quanbeck moved that the substitute motion, referring the question of affiliation to the congregations be tabled, This motion prevailed. With the discussion thus brought back to the resolution carried over from the previous year another substitute was offered, this one by Pastor Chester Blake: "Moved that the Lutheran Free Church does not join the World Council of Churches." A debate followed in which Professor Iver Olson, Pastor M. E. Helland and Dr. Melvin Helland spoke in favor of membership while Pastor P. A. Strommen spoke in opposition.

Burntvedt next read a letter from Zion Lutheran Church of Thief River Falls, Minnesota, in which the LFC was urged not to join. The congregation's pastor, Walter M. Pedersen, also spoke out strongly against membership. The time for adjournment having arrived, a motion prevailed that the afternoon business session be extended twenty minutes. During this time Dr. Christensen and Pastor H. C. Caspersen spoke in favor of affiliation. With the extended time used up and with still nine men wanting to speak it was decided that discussion be continued the next day. Debate was resumed the next morning with the understanding that as soon as the nine men had been granted the floor a vote would be taken. All but one spoke in opposition to Council membership, after which President Burntvedt read another letter from a member congregation also negative toward the WCC. It was next agreed that the final vote be by secret ballot. The substitute motion with its negative recommendation, which had been made the previous afternoon, was now tabled so that the resolution as carried over from the 1947 annual conference was again before the delegates. A count of the ballots revealed that membership in the World Council of Churches had been overwhelmingly rejected by a vote of 101 to 246.[19]

C. The Evangelical Lutheran Church

The Evangelical Lutheran Church, or the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America as it was known from the time of its organization as a merged body in 1917 until 1946 when its name was officially changed, also had comparatively early contacts with ecumenical deliberations. One of its pastors,

S. O. Sigmond, was present at the 1927 Lausanne Conference as a co-opted member.[20] Sigmond and Dr. Herman Preus were at Edinburgh in 1937 as "official and fraternal visitors."[21]

In November 1938 the NLCA was asked to join the World Council. No acknowledgment of the invitation having been received, Dr. Leiper on January 16, 1939 wrote President J. A. Aasgaard whether the earlier communication had reached him and if so whether there had been any response by his church. The latter replied that the invitation had indeed been received but that no action had as yet been taken.[22] Thus the matter stood for the next five years. In March 1944 Leiper again wrote asking whether anything further had been done. In his letter he called attention to the Lutheran churches which had already joined and to the role being played by individual Lutherans in the WCC's ministry to war prisoners and refugees.[23] Aasgaard replied that no further action had as yet been taken, nor did he know what his church might do. He was of the opinion, however, that it was not yet ready to accept membership. Perhaps at some future date the matter might possibly receive favorable and sympathetic consideration. He referred appreciatively to the service of the Church of Sweden in behalf of Axis prisoners of war in America.[24] Leiper hastened to correct Aasgaard's understanding on this point, explaining that the work with war prisoners was that of the World Council rather than of the Church of Sweden which had been asked by the WCC to appoint a chaplain for such service. He stressed the fact that the services of Pastor Wenngren, associated with the New York office, were not denominational but interdenominational. One reason why Council officials were so eager to have churches affiliate was the fact that their only approach to the prisoners of war was through the WCC's Ecumenical Chaplaincy Commission and the Y.M.C.A.'s special war service. Leiper assured Aasgaard that the unity envisioned in the World Council would leave each church completely free in its own autonomous life, without any danger of being compromised or overruled in its independence. He expressed hope that he might soon have opportunity to discuss the whole matter personally with the NLCA president.[25]

A year later, in response to an invitation to special meetings in New York at which WCC leaders Boegner, Bell and Visser 't Hooft were to be present, Aasgaard wrote that he would have been very happy to attend but found it impossible to do so. In his reply to Leiper he spoke appreciatively of the fine courtesy and understanding which the General Secretary had extended the American Lutheran commissioners who had recently visited Europe.[26] Later in 1945 the NLCA president represented his church at the all-Lutheran meeting and joined in the confessional representation petition.[27]

Dr. Aasgaard spoke highly of the World Council at his church's June 1946 convention. He called special attention to the opportunity for service provided by the Council and to the fact that membership would in no way imply a yielding of confessions, practices or principles.[28] The Church Council brought in the following resolution recommending that the NLCA affiliate with the world organization:

> Whereas the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America has been invited to join the World Council of Churches;
>
> Whereas the Council is a fellowship of churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior;
>
> Whereas the Council is not a federation but a fellowship of churches with no authority to legislate for the participating bodies and can act for these only as far as all or any of them have commissioned it to do so;
>
> Whereas membership in the Council carries with it no implication of altar and pulpit fellowship;
>
> Whereas, though we know that full unity has not been achieved among the Christian churches, we believe there is a unity in allegiance to Christ which cries out for a more adequate expression;
>
> Whereas the nature of the church demands that it make manifest the unity in Christ of all who believe in Him;
>
> Whereas there is a great need for Christians to stand together against the fierce onslaught of the forces of unbelief and ungodliness that challenge the principles and menace the life of the Church;
>
> Whereas membership in the Council will give an opportunity to bring our distinctive Lutheran witness to bear on the life and work of the Church throughout the world and be mutually beneficial to us and to others;
>
> Whereas our Lutheran brethren in northern Europe already are active in the formation of the Council and

several Lutheran bodies in our country have taken steps looking towards membership in the Council; and

Whereas some of the relief for our distressed brethren in Europe through our Lutheran World Action funds must be distributed through the agency of the Council;

Therefore, Be It Resolved, That the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America accepts membership in the World Council of Churches and authorizes its Church Council and the Board of Trustees to implement this action.[29]

When the above resolution came up for consideration by the convention the church's Board of Review submitted the following substitute:

The Norwegian Lutheran Church of America has been invited to join the World Council of Churches. Membership in this Council is open to the non-Roman churches of the world. Its object is to present a united Christian front in the situations that face churches the world over. It implies no yielding of confessions, practices or principles by any of the member bodies, but united cooperation in as far as each member accepts that responsibility. It has no authority to legislate for participating bodies. It acts only for them as far as it has been commissioned to do so. It implies no altar or pulpit fellowship, but offers the opportunity to cooperate with other Christian Churches where it can be done according to our principles and our confession. Its membership shall be based on denominational representation as far as the Lutheran Church is concerned. On the basis of these principles,

Be It Resolved, That the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America accepts membership in the World Council of Churches and authorizes its Church Council and the Board of Trustees to implement this action.[30]

The only significant change or addition included in the substitute motion was the stipulation that membership in the Council must be on the basis of "denominational representation."

The elected leadership of the NLCA was practically unanimous in its support of membership in the World Council. The church's president, Aasgaard, the entire Church Council which included all of the District presidents and the Board of Review were all agreed that WCC membership was desirable. But in spite of their whole-hearted endorsement delegates to the 1946 convention were not ready to act. Many felt that to join the Council would represent a radical departure from the traditional stand of their church and that further consideration should be given the matter before reaching a final decision. Accordingly Dr. T. F. Gullixon presented the following resolution which was adopted without discussion:

> The Norwegian Lutheran Church of America is sincerely appreciative of the Christian beneficence toward the peoples of Lutheran lands and Lutheran minority groups in war-torn Europe channeled through the agencies of the World Council of Churches. We are mindful of the possibilities for service to humanity through such an agency as is outlined by the Provisional Committee of the World Council. But inasmuch as the history, the organizational framework, and the program of the World Council are not well known to the delegates and pastors of this convention,
>
> Be It Resolved, That Resolution No. 21, Page 41, relative to present organic membership in the World Council of Churches, and the report of the Board of Review relative to the same subject be referred to the Church Council for study and report to the next general convention.[31]

Dr. O. G. Malmin in reporting the convention action suggested that the Lutheran Herald, of which he was editor, be used for a thorough discussion of the issue. And indeed quite considerable was to be the treatment given to the subject during the ensuing biennium.[32]

The first to speak were the District presidents who expressed keen disappointment over the 1946 convention's failure to approve affiliation with the World Council:

> While the world is on fire, we must wait two whole years before we decide whether we are going to make joint cause with fellow Christians in an organized and planned effort to put out, or at least check, the fire.
>
> In a time when every minute counts, we, who with our fellow Christians all are convinced that a just and lasting peace must be founded upon the principles of Christianity, have to wait at least two years before we can add our mite to a joint Christian impact upon those who are to make the peace. ...
>
> Today the World Council is still in process of formation. Today, jointly with other Lutherans, we could have had an opportunity to contribute something toward its 'organizational framework and program.' Two years from now we shall have to fit ourselves into a ready-made framework and program.[33]

In May and June 1947, at the time that the District conventions were all devoting a part of their programs to a discussion of possible membership in the World Council, Dr. Malmin published a series of four editorials on the matter. The most important of these was the third in which he weighed the question whether affiliation would constitute a violation of the ELC's strong stand against "unionism," which he defined as "participation in worship and other spiritual relationships with those with whom we are not in doctrinal agreement in such a way that our participation constitutes a denial of faith."[34]

Opponents of Council membership insisted that the question of unionism was at stake, while those favoring the church's entry were just as convinced that no compromising of faith would be involved. Malmin agreed that should participation in the WCC represent unionism then the forthcoming vote must be looked upon as a "decision of conscience," in which loyalty to an accepted stand of the church would require a rejection of the proposal to affiliate. If, however, unionism was not involved it would simply be a "decision of judgment" in which advantages and disadvantages, responsibilities and dangers could properly be weighed over against one another. It was not the church's stand on unionism that was in question, but whether or not membership in the Council would actually constitute "a pretense of union which does not exist." Should the church ever feel it necessary to reexamine its position a study of the issues would have to be carefully and thoroughly undertaken in the light of the Word of God and the Lutheran confessions. Meanwhile, it was bound to reject all unionism by virtue of its constitution, its adherence to the "Minneapolis Theses" and its membership in the American Lutheran Conference formed on the basis of these Theses. It was not to be concluded, however, that joining the Council would actually violate the church's position. No mingling of worship was implied nor was the church being asked to participate in spiritual programs which it could not sanction. It was not suggested that membership indicated doctrinal agreement among the various bodies as illustrated by the inclusion of the Orthodox on the one hand and of the Methodists on the other. Complete sovereignty was assured the participating churches by constitutional provision. Recognition of the principle of confessional representation would further safeguard the doctrinal integrity of each church. Other American Lutheran bodies, which also had official statements against unionism, had seen fit to join the Council fully convinced that their stand was not being violated.*

In his fourth editorial Malmin cited four reasons in favor of Council membership: (1) As part of the family of Christian churches it was the duty of the ELC to participate in the common work of the world organization. (2) The critical times called for a united Christian testimony. (3) The Council was serving as an effective channel for service in the great task of relief and rehabilitation. (4) Lutheran solidarity should be maintained in regard to participation in ecumenical efforts. Negative arguments warned that membership would result in a drift away from sound doctrine and a consequent "de-Lutheranizing" of thought within the church. Unionistic practices at the local level would be encouraged. Rather than joining the Council it would be better to strengthen the Lutheran World Federation as an organization parallel to the World Council, cooperating with it, but not a part of it.[35]

While opponents to Council membership kept insisting on the greater importance of the Lutheran World Federation they consistently ignored the LWF's open endorsement of the World Council. For example, when J.W. Ylvisaker, special correspondent covering the Lund Assembly, prepared his report for the Lutheran Herald he omitted all reference to the constitutional provision there unanimously agreed upon that the LWF was "To foster Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements."[36]

Dr. N. Astrup Larsen in an August 26, 1947 article on "Conscience and the World Council," insisted that loyalty to the Lutheran confessions required not isolation but participation in interdenominational efforts. This was partly in answer to Malmin's suggestion that a "decision of conscience" could be only in the direction of refusing membership over the unionism issue while favorable action would be more a "decision of judgment." Larsen held that Lutherans were conscience bound to share in the common work of the churches.[37]

The argument that entry into the Council would represent unacceptable unionism was to be frequently repeated. Pastor Julian G. Anderson contended that the WCC by its own statement was a unionistic endeavor since it held that one of its purposes was "to present a unity of faith," a unity obviously lacking. Ecumenical services he viewed as unionism of the grossest kind. To enter the Council would mean joining hands approvingly with modernists who in Council publications openly ridiculed fundamental Lutheran doctrines such as the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture and the blood atonement of Christ.[38] Pastor Norman Harstad warned that modernists in the World Council were "false prophets" who needed to be completely avoided.[39] Pastor J. H. Myrwang viewed the WCC as "a man-made effort to actualize the Una Sancta in a WORLD CHURCH OF CHRIST" in which differences even in fundamental doctrines would be overlooked as being unimportant. Unionistic altar and pulpit fellowship he saw not as a mere hidden danger but rather as a goal openly sought and as a practice already in effect in World Council circles.[40]

Those favoring Council membership stressed the urgency of having their church share its heritage of faith with others. An editorial appearing November 11, 1947, while making no reference to the WCC discussed the accusation that Lutherans of America were guilty of withholding an effective witness to evangelical truth. Two evaluations critical of this isolationist tendency were quoted. The first was from a letter written by an ELC pastor pursuing graduate studies in a non-Lutheran seminary in the East. Commenting on the mixture of "bold, brash, old-fashioned modernism" and the "definite interest in revealed Christianity" which he had encountered, the writer deplored the lack of a positive contribution by American Lutheranism:

> In this peculiar mixture there is an amazing ingredient of authentic Luther interest and research. ... This causes the students (graduate students especially) to dig into the Reformation. This renaissance of interest in Luther does not mean an interest in American Lutheranism. ... These people are becoming evangelical in the Lutheran sense without the benefit of the Lutheran Church's testimony. ... They are 'returning to the fold,' not because of the Lutheran Church in America, but in spite of it--in spite of its testimony or lack of testimony to them.[41]

The other quotation was from a 1942 editorial which had appeared in the Christian Century:

> In the rediscovery by American Protestantism of the truth and the faith through which the Reformation brought new spiritual life to Western Christianity, Lutherans of America would do well to weigh the fact that they have played an almost negligible part. Their policy of isolation has debarred them from impregnating the rest of Protestantism with the very truths which it had lost and which Lutheranism possessed. ... The gross fact is that our American Churches have for two decades been moving in a general way toward the position occupied by their Lutheran brethren, but only the slightest credit can be taken by the Lutheran Churches for this rapprochement.[42]

In a letter appearing in the Lutheran Herald a few weeks later Pastor A. N. Rogness suggested that the importance of membership in the WCC was being over-magnified while at the same time he warned that non-participation would represent a denying of the Lutheran witness and possibly a reversion "to the 'monastic mood' which the Reformation so courageously repudiated."[43]

In spite of official protests to the contrary many viewed the World Council as a movement intended to eventuate in a united world church. In an editorial on "The Protestant Urge to Unite" Dr. Malmin wrote as follows:

> While this organization has many immediate tasks to perform, it is avowedly an ecumenical movement, and it cannot be doubted that it strives toward the ideal of a united, worldwide Christian Church. Into its fabric has been incorporated the 'Faith and Order' movement, which attempts to foster doctrinal discussion looking to greater unity. That alone stamps it as an organization which aims at a united Church. It must, however, be added that such a 'super-church' can, under the organization's constitution, be effected only from the bottom, through action of the sovereign Churches making up its membership, not from the top.[44]

Some weeks later Malmin published a letter which he had received from Dr. Wentz in which the latter had taken strong exception to the above quoted evaluation:

> I feel that you have not given a correct interpretation of the World Council of Churches, and that the interpretation you do give may lead to undesirable results in The Evangelical Lutheran Church.
>
> For one thing I feel very strongly that it is a mistake to identify the word ecumenical with the word united, particularly with the meaning which you seem to ascribe to united. There are three elements in ecumenicity, and unity is only one of them. The other two are propulsion and penetration, that is, expansion across the earth and permeation of culture. Moreover, unity, as an element of ecumenicity, does not mean union. It means fellowship and co-operation.
>
> It is regrettable, I think, that you stamp the World Council of Churches, as 'ecumenical' in your limited sense of the word, that you assert that 'it strives toward the ideal of a united, worldwide Christian Church' and that you ascribe to it the aim of becoming a 'super-church.'

> Some of us in The Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches have been at special pains to keep clear the purpose of the World Council, and we very much wish you had consulted the official documents before writing your editorial.[45]

To establish his point Dr. Wentz quoted from the statement on the nature and purpose of the World Council adopted by the Provisional Committee earlier that year in which it was pointedly disavowed that the Council aims to become a united world church. Malmin, however, continued to believe that the very logic of the Council's position made it inevitable that its ultimate objective must be a union of churches: "Wether now, a generation from now, or a century from now--surely, at some point along the way, the very idea of 'ecumenicity' must necessarily involve the thought of union."[46]

On February 13, 1948 a sixty-five page booklet entitled Should We Join The World Council Of Churches? came off the presses of the ELC's Augsburg Publishing House.[47] In it Dr. N. Astrup Larsen urged affiliation while Pastor R. A. Ofstedal presented arguments in opposition to Council membership.

Larsen held that the very nature of the church as defined in the ecumenical creeds and the Lutheran confessions obligated Lutherans to participate. Practical recognition should be given to professed faith in "one holy Christian Church, the communion of saints," by cooperating with fellow Christians in other churches.[48] He pointed to the missionary background of the ecumenical movement, noting that the impetus leading to the emergence of the organizations eventuating in the World Council was derived primarily from the world missionary conferences and not from the Federal Council as sometimes erroneously maintained and that its basic concern was how the churches might the most effectively carry on their primary task of evangelizing the world.[49] In his treatment of the nature, purpose and tasks of the WCC he emphasized that it was in no sense a super-church but an organ of the churches intended to manifest such unity as is found to be real, a consultative body without legislative powers, an instrument of the churches for study, ecumenical conversations and mutual aid.[50]

Larsen pointed to Soederblom, Eidem and Berggrav as examples of Lutheran leadership combining sound confessionalism with an ecumenical spirit. He quoted reports on the 1947 Lund Assembly calling attention to the LWF's strong confessional position on the one hand and its endorsement of Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements on the other.[51] He denied that membership in the World Council would constitute unionism. Even though there were admittedly modernists, liberals and individuals with "humanistic aberrations" in some of the member churches no compromise would be involved, since the WCC deals not with individuals but with churches--churches which officially accept Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. Participation in promiscuous unionistic practices on the congregational or parish level were not required, nor need there be a lowering of Lutheran confessional standards or a weakening of the Lutheran confessional witness. He quoted from a statement by Dr. Cavert indicating that Council leaders did not at all desire an ignoring of doctrinal differences nor a watering down of convictions.[52] In concluding his presentation Larsen urged that the ELC join the World Council in order best to fulfill the church's mission in the world of today.

> Our Lutheran Confession is not a hot house plant which needs to be nursed and protected. It is a force which must be turned loose in the world. We have a contribution to make. We have a responsibility to let our light shine.
>
> God help us not to shirk.[53]

Pastor Ofstedal looked upon the WCC as but a lengthened shadow of the Federal Council whose leaders he branded as modernist deniers of revealed truth and promoters of a least-common-denominator type of faith. In a large chart which he had drawn up he pictured the Federal Council as the main connecting link between 19th century ecumenical efforts and the World Council.[54] Statements by leaders of the former organization were quoted in which credit was claimed for the emergence of the latter.[55] Because of the close tie seen to exist between the two, membership in the WCC was opposed on the ground that the ELC could have no fellowship in a world body with a doctrinal position capable of modernist interpretation and with a leadership which denied fundamental tenets of the Christian faith. Affiliation was also opposed because of the inclusion of the Eastern Orthodox churches. He sharply criticized both organizations for a unionism seeking to promote fellowship with "those who do not accord Christ His rightful place as the one and only Mediator between God and man and who offer prayer to and worship the Virgin Mary."[56] Attention was called to union services sponsored by the Federal Council in which Mary and other saints were included in the prayers. Quoting a statement by Van Dusen that the presence of the Orthodox churches in the ecumenical movement would "alter its character and emphases in ways which cannot yet be wholly foreseen," Ofstedal urged his church to stay out of the World Council until it could be seen in which direction the new world organization was headed. He could see nothing but a compromise of evangelical truth in a body which had within it the Orthodox churches with their Mariolatry and saint worship and which was seeking to have even the Roman Catholic Church included in its ranks.[57]

Ofstedal warned that ELC membership would result in unionistic practices at the congregational level. Such pressure would be put on pastors and congregations that they would not be able to withhold participation in union services and other unionistic activities. To illustrate how WCC leaders were already promoting such services the following paragraph from the Council pamphlet, What? Why? Who? was quoted:

> Remember every step toward union through fellowship or service with Christian groups constitutes moves in the right direction. Ecumenicity begins with a sense of identity and one-ness among all Christians and it can best begin in our local communities where churches and councils function. Christian unity at the top is not enough; it needs support by Christian cooperation and unity at the bottom. ... Interchange of preachers, ecumenical services, seminars and study groups, corporate visits to other churches ... and lectures on their essential contribution to the rich and varied fabric of Christianity will widen our spiritual horizons and establish world fellowship as a reality among us.[50]

That joint services and activities were intended to be but an intermediate step leading to an amalgamation of churches of various confessional backgrounds was seen in further recommendations such as those brought forward by Dr. H. Paul Douglass, editor of Christendom, quarterly publication of the American Committee for the World Council. In an article entitled "Ecumenicity Across the Street" Douglass had outlined a plan for ecumenical fellowship at the local level which had at its goal the union of congregations in a given community. He suggested that churches of different denominations join in worship on festive days or for eight consecutive Sundays during the summer months. To facilitate such services a "lowest common denominator" type of liturgy might be worked out and used. A next step would be cooperative programs based on "deliberate lay decision," the eventual goal of which might well be "abandonment, merger, removal or adaption of some of the existing churches." A laity committed to such a program could put pressure on hesitant bishops and similar church officials in order to gain the desired end of a consolidation of churches.[59] It is not surprising that Ofstedal should view with alarm a proposal which would ignore the doctrinal positions of the various churches, implying that convictions of faith are a matter of completely secondary importance.

> What price will the churches have to pay for unionism? Under this practice churches become united, not by agreement in doctrine, but rather by overlooking those portions of the Word on which there is disagreement. Thus the impression is fostered that the Word is not important, and doctrinal indifference is created. The result will be, if the process is continued, not union in the Word of Truth (John 17:17-21), but union in spite of the Truth. Finally you have a church without conviction, with the fatal consequences that this brings. For compromise in the Word is disobedience to the Word and to God, and can only end in death. If this is true, what can we expect of a movement whose history and present ideals are so bound up with unionism as is the World Council of Churches, likewise the Federal Council?[60]

Were the WCC only an emergency organization seeking cooperation in externals, such as giving relief to countries ravaged by war, affiliation would be permissible. As successor to Faith and Order and Life and Work, however, it was committed to a program seeking a united church. Indeed Christians should pray and work toward such unity for that is God's will. But it must be done as the Scriptures direct. John 17, which includes Jesus' prayer "that they all may be one," is usually taken out of context by enthusiasts for the Council, even to the extent of misrepresentation. Jesus was not merely praying for unity but for the effective working of the Word in bringing man to faith and consequently into unity with one another. While Jesus thus inseparably linked Christian unity to the influence of the Scriptures the WCC constitution in strange contrast failed to make a single mention of the Word. Ephesians 4:10-14, which stresses the importance of firmly grounded convictions, unity in faith and the speaking of the truth in love, suggests that a program seeking unity of the church must proceed on the basis of agreement in the truth as revealed in the Word and not just through some scheme for united action.[61]

In sections entitled "What Should Be Our Attitude Toward False Teachings and False Teachers?" and "How Should We Deal With False Teachers and Apostates From The Faith?" Ofstedal quoted the following proof-texts in support of his contention that the Scriptures themselves were warning the ELC not to have anything to do with the WCC, filled with unbelieving modernists and liberals.

> Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits.[62]

> Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.[63]
>
> Their word doth eat as doth gangrene.[64]
>
> Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine you have learned; and avoid them.[65]
>
> And if any man obey not our words by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy but admonish him as a brother.[66]
>
> Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you and bring not this teaching receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed. For he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds.[67]

The publication of the booklet, Should We Join The World Council Of Churches?, was followed by a renewed wave of articles and letters in the columns of the Lutheran Herald.[68] Dr. Malmin in an editorial evaluation expressed surprise that Larsen had made no reference to the much discussed matter of confessional representation.[69] The latter replied that he had never looked upon that specific matter as being of great importance, although he was glad the Provisional Committee was proposing an amendment in keeping with the request of the Lutherans. He was of the opinion that the whole representation issue had been unduely magnified since the constitution stipulated that member churches would be represented by delegates chosen by themselves, so that there would be no possibility that Lutherans would be represented by Methodists, Presbyterians or any other but Lutherans.[70]

Ofstedal, seeking to refute Malmin's statement that the former had failed to prove any close connection between the Federal Council and the World Council, pointed to Cavert, Oxnam, Charles Taft, Leiper, and the Committee on a Just and Durable Peace as instances of administrative and committee links between the two. In reply to those noting that Ofstedal's criticism was directed against individuals while the World Council was an organization of churches, the latter argued that the WCC had come into being primarily through the initiative and action of individuals rather than of churches. He cited as examples Archbishop Temple, Dr. Cavert, the self-appointed Committee which eventually became the Committee of 35 and the Provisional Committee which was acting as if the World Council had already been formed. Because of the strategic place of individuals in the World Council it was held to be entirely valid to point to the modernist views of such leaders in warning his church against affiliation. To those urging membership provided representation be on a confessional basis he replied that the Biblical provision for a confessional witness is that errorists be avoided. "but though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."[71] Quoting the verse of Scripture that "evil companionships corrupt good manners," Ofstedal warned that Lutherans would indeed be negatively affected if they fellowshipped with non-believers in the World Council. It was his opinion that the problems facing Christians called not for a coalition of churches to form pressure groups in political situations, but for greater faithfulness to God's Word, the weapons of the church being spiritual, not carnal.[72]

Larsen criticized Ofstedal for completely ignoring the Una Sancta, a doctrine basic in the Lutheran confessional position. He took issue also with the latter's attempt to give the impression that ELC proponents of Council membership were inclined to disregard confessional differences. Nothing could be further from the truth. Loyal to the confessional position they were at the same time also concerned how Lutherans might make the truth they possess count most for the advancement of God's Kingdom. While there are differences which dare not be ignored and which make any consideration of merger impossible, Lutherans must at the same time acknowledge that they hold in common with other churches faith that Jesus Christ is the Incarnate Son of God and the only Saviour of mankind. There is need for a common confession of this faith and for a joint testimony, such as can be given through channels of the WCC without any lowering of the flag of confession, without unionism. Larsen held that it was not a fair comparison to say that Council membership is oh the same level as the fellowship sought between Luther and Zwingli at Marburg, the two cases not being parallel. Luther at Marburg refused to recognize full church unity on the basis of a compromise in doctrine. Membership in the World Council did not call for the giving up of a single iota of one's confession. Larsen further held that the Bible verses quoted by Ofstedal in an attempt to show that to join the Council would constitute unionism could not conceivably be applied to Christians who confess Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. Rather than branding those with whom we differ as false teachers and apostates we must recognize the sincerity with which the different interpretations are held even though we must continue to reject such interpretations and because of them refuse to establish altar and pulpit fellowship with those adhering to them. We should at least be thankful that those with whom we differ in some important points do hold to Christ as God and Saviour. "Conscience bound by the Word of God" does not require that Christians act toward one another as if they were enemies instead of allies with whom to stand side by side in the fight against the devil, the world and the flesh. Commenting on Ofstedal's suggestion that "free conferences" be held with other evangelicals as the proper approach to the question of church unity, Larsen pointed out that this was one of the very things which the World Council was to cultivate. The former was sharply critized for branding Dr. George Buttrick and others like him as "deniers of the faith." This certainly was not putting the best construction on what our neighbor says or does, Buttrick being a "confessor" who through travail had reached surety of faith. Larsen denied the insinuation that the WCC intended to go into politics, the Council in no way viewing politics as a substitute for the Gospel:

> World Council leaders ... do not aspire to be political wire-pullers, but to stress spiritual and moral principles rooted in the Gospel of Christ. That is not to make power politics substitute for, or even an adjunct to, the proclamation of the Gospel. Pastor Ofstedal recognizes as clearly as anyone that there is no solution for the political, economic, and social problems of the world except that which flows from the Gospel of Christ. And he will not deny that Christians should bear witness to that fact. John Foster Dulles, Frederick Nolde, and others whom he quotes (but, I fear, misinterprets), mean nothing else. But they are convinced that the testimony of the Church is more likely to be heard and heeded when it is the strong voice of millions speaking in unison out of a burning heart, than when it comes from small isolated groups or individuals who are afraid of making a common front.[73]

Dr. Martin Anderson, president of the ELC's Eastern District, in an article entitled "Shall We Join the World Council?" presented a careful study of the nature and significance of the new world organization, closing with an urgent plea that his church affiliate. He pointed out that the WCC was not a federation of churches, certainly not a union of churches into a super-church, but a council for study, a forum for deliberation, a consultative body through which the participating denominational groups might study together the issues of common concern and through which expression might be given to whatever measure of unity is found to exist. While Lutherans of America had hitherto been more concerned with achieving unity among themselves than with participation in ecumenical movements he felt that the time had come for them to define more adequately what their relation should be to other churches. It was urgent that practical recognition be given to the doctrine of the communion of saints. Indeed the unity for which Christ prayed was not primarily organizational but spiritual, but it was certainly imperative that this unity make itself manifest in such a way that the world will see it and be encouraged to believe.

Anderson noted that other Lutheran churches of America had already accepted membership in the World Council and that the LWF by constitutional provision was fostering Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements. While the other Lutheran churches of the Federation could not be the conscience of the ELC the favorable action by most member churches would seem to indicate that the burden of proof rested with those contending that membership was wrong. He called attention to the fact that the ELC's Church Council, comprised of the president of the church, the nine district presidents and a layman from each district, had voted unanimously to recommend affiliation. In reviewing arguments for and against joining the WCC he stressed the importance of having both sides respect the sincerity and integrity of those with whom they disagreed. It should be mutually acknowledged that those favoring membership were just as conscientious in their loyalty to the Scriptures and the Lutheran confessions as were their opponents. They were just as well aware of the issues involved and just as deeply concerned with the church's welfare.[74]

Dr. Frederick A. Schiotz, who in 1954 was elected president of the ELC, was also of the conviction that membership should be accepted in the World Council. In a brief article "Issues In The World Council Decision" he pointed to three basic questions calling for consideration:

> (1) What is the New Testament conception of the Church?
>
> (2) Are we entering a union of Protestant Churches or are we joining a council, an agency where God asks us to make our testimony?
>
> (3) What tasks are there in today's world which God has given His Church to do which cannot be done effectively except in some such relationship as the World Council presents?[75]

He stated that a study of these questions had led him to the decision that he must vote for affiliation. To him the 1947 action by the LWF was highly significant. Recalling developments at the Lund Assembly he noted that

> The constitution that was introduced at Lund asked the Federation 'to achieve a united Lutheran approach to ecumenical Christian movements.' However, the convention changed this to the more positive statement: "To foster Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements." This amendment was discussed more than any other that was introduced on the convention floor, and when the vote was called, there was no dissenting voice.
>
> In this action of the Federation there is eloquent reason for saying that this was the voice of the Lutheran Church--not a synod, but the Church--speaking its mind. To be sure, even though the whole Church has spoken, if it is against Scripture, one would not hesitate to stand alone in opposition. But even as this is true, it is equally true that when the voice of the Church has spoken after a prayerful deliberation that extends over several years, we had better be very sure that we are not opposing the good and gracious work of God's Holy Spirit.[78]

As the 1948 convention approached another prominent voice, heretofore neutral, came out in favor of joining the World Council. Dr. O. G. Malmin, editor of the Lutheran Herald, in an editorial appearing April 27, stated that while he would have preferred a strengthened Lutheran World Federation including all Lutheran churches in the world which would have been related to the World Council only on the basis of liaison between two separate world bodies, he nevertheless favored affiliation with the Council especially since ninety percent of all Lutherans of the world had already accepted membership. Taking note of the long article by Dr. Anderson, which appeared in the same issue of the Lutheran Herald, Malmin expressed himself to be in agreement with the arguments there given. The editor of the church's paper critized the argument frequently advanced by opponents to the WCC which repeatedly insisted "We base our objections on the Word of God," with the inevitable implication that those favoring affiliation evidenced less fidelity to the Word--"something which we deny with all possible emphasis." In spite of the extensive debate Malmin was of the opinion there had never actually been a full meeting of minds. Advocates of membership, convinced that their stand was in complete harmony with the Scriptures, had stressed the need for practical recognition of the doctrine of the Una Sancta and the urgency for a united witness and co-operative action. Opponents, on the other hand, had not wrestled with these arguments. Instead, they had proceeded on the basis that the Bible forbids fellowship of the type proposed and had continued to insist that they were therefore conscience bound to vote against affiliation. Malmin questioned the validity of the Scripture passages cited, noting that they originally dealt with individuals, usually heathen, who were enemies of the Gospel and not with churches accepting Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. He was critical also of the inclination to condemn whole churches because of the presence of a few errorists. A given group is ordinarily not condemned as immoral simply because one of its members is guilty of immorality.[77]

Delegates to the 1948 convention certainly were not lacking in information on the World Council as had been the case two years earlier. During the biennium sixty-nine articles filling sixty pages had been published in the Lutheran Herald in addition to which there had appeared the sixty-five page booklet by Larsen and Ofstedal.[78]

In his president's report, published prior to the convention, Dr. Aasgaard urged that membership in the World Council be approved:

> The Christian Church faces a chaos and crisis which demands unified action by all Christians, where it is not contrary to our faith and principles. Disintegrating forces are at work that make common action, as has been planned in the World Council of Churches, as wide as possible; however, with the reservation that the individual church bodies always determine how far such cooperation shall extend. Any association of evangelical churches to such an approach must rest on a sound and definite confession. It is definitely stated that this association of Churches will be composed only of Churches which accept Jesus Christ as God and Savior. Questions have been raised as to how it is possible for individuals and certain denominations or organizations to affiliate on this basis. That is a matter of conscience between them and their God. The World Council of Churches has accepted this standard of faith.
>
> Following the principles with which we deal with each other as Churches, the Provisional Committee, through the efforts of American Lutherans, is pledged to delegates being selected by their respective Churches, and responsible to their Churches as such for their actions. Any departure from this standard would involve our withdrawal from the Council.
>
> On insistence by Lutherans in the Provisional Committee, a separate Communion Service has been arranged for the Lutheran Church. This is a testimony that there

is no altar and pulpit fellowship with other groups represented in the Council.

Among Churches represented in the Council, is the Greek Orthodox Church. This Church does not accept the ministry or Sacraments of the Protestant Church. This is an indication that it cannot be taken for granted that there is a putting aside of differences in confessions and doctrines as represented by the individual denominations.

Finally, there is the question of local councils, In this our attitude undoubtedly will be the same as dealing with present existing ministerial and church councils in this country. Co-operation and co-ordination of common interests can be only insofar as it does not violate our faithfulness to the confessions of our Church, her principles and practices. This situation we have had before and will continue to have, regardless of whether there is a World Council of Churches or not.[79]

The Church Council brought in the following statement and recommendation:

1. The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of independent churches which believe in Jesus Christ as God and Savior.

2. The functions of the Council are study, witnessing, and cooperation in such matters and areas as may be authorized by the member churches.

3. The Council is formed to serve the member churches, not to legislate for them or control them. It disavows any thought of becoming a single unified church structure or a super church.

4. The Provisional Committee proposes that membership in the Council be on a confessional basis and it is expected that the assembly will adopt this proposal. The Lutheran churches thus will be represented in the Council by men of their own choosing. They will sacrifice neither their identity nor their confessions.

5. Membership in the World Council does not involve pulpit and altar fellowship with non-Lutherans. In

keeping with this principle provision has been made for a strictly Lutheran communion service at the First World Assembly of the Churches to be held in Amsterdam, August 22 to September 5, this year.

6. There is thus no 'unionism' connected with participation in the World Council of Churches, unionism being described in the following words of the so-called Minneapolis Theses: 'Where the establishment and maintenance of church fellowship ignores present doctrinal differences or declares them a matter of indifference, there is unionism, pretense of union which does not exist.'

7. The present chaotic and distracted condition of the world, and the deep conviction that Christ is the only hope for a bewildered and lost humanity, requires of us that we seek to discover the things we have in common with our fellow Christians of other groups, and that we present a joint Christian testimony and make a united Christian impact upon the world wherever points of agreement can be found.

8. We believe that in this world situation it is more important than ever for us as Lutherans to testify to the truths which constitute our special heritage and thus make our definite and positive contribution toward world Christianity. We have a responsibility to let the light shine which God has given us. We believe that The Evangelical Lutheran Church should stand shoulder to shoulder with the Lutheran bodies of the United States and other countries who have accepted membership in the Council in order to strengthen the witness and impact of the Lutheran Church.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That The Evangelical Lutheran Church now accepts membership in the World Council of Churches on a confessional basis and authorizes the Church Council to take all necessary steps towards full membership and for representation at the coming first World Assembly of Churches to be held in Amsterdam, August 22 to September 5, this year.[80]

The entire afternoon session on Friday, June 11, 1948 was devoted to a consideration of the above resolution. Before debate began it was decided to allow ten minutes to the opening speaker on each side, three minutes to each succeeding speaker except the last two, and ten minutes to each of them. Several provisions were added to the resolution as submitted by the Church Council. One provided that the 1948 decision should be reviewed by the 1952 convention. Another sought to safeguard the church against unionism at the local congregational level. In keeping with a suggestion by Dr. Aasgaard it was agreed that a two-thirds vote be required for approval of Council membership. When the 1,418 ballots were counted it was found that the proposal for ELC entrance into the WCC had been decisively rejected by a vote of 546 to 872.[81]

CHAPTER XI

AMERICAN LUTHERANS AT AMSTERDAM

A. The Role of American Lutheran Delegates at Amsterdam

The First Assembly of the World Council, comprised of 351 delegates representing 147 churches from 44 countries, was held at Amsterdam from August 22 to September 4, 1948. Ten of the delegates were from the five Lutheran churches of America which had voted to accept membership. They included Mr. Martin Ewald and Dr. Harold Yochum of the ALC, the Rev. Alfred Jensen of the DELC, Drs. Bersell and Nils Nilson of the AugS, Prof. Paul Nyholm of the UELC and Drs. Fry, Wentz, Stoughton and Mrs. Josephine Almond of the ULCA.[1]

The American Lutheran delegates played active roles in deliberations of the Assembly. Wentz served on the highly influential business committee which steered affairs at Amsterdam. Fry was on the sub-committee which redrafted the statement on the nature and purpose of the WCC. Also, he played an active role on the advisory committee dealing with the budget. Fry, Yochum and Nyholm were members of the Assembly's policy committee. Stoughton served as chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with "The Significance of the Laity in the Church," sharing prominently in the drafting of its final report and, as chairman of the committee, presenting the report to one of the plenary sessions.[2] Fry and Bersell were elected to the Central Committee, the former being named vice-chairman of that important body following the Amsterdam Assembly and chairman six years later.[3] Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, an alternate for the ULCA and a consultant to the Assembly, served as secretary of the study section which deliberated on "The Church and the International Disorder." Director of the WCC's Commission of Churches for International Affairs and one of the contributors to the "Amsterdam Series" of preparatory study materials, Nolde was subsequently appointed to serve as one of the World Council's five associate general secretaries "with the portfolio of International Affairs and with headquarters in New York."[4] Dr. Stewart Herman, also an alternate for the ULCA served as secretary of the Alternates' Committee on Program and Administration.[5]

B. Adoption of the Horsham Amendment

The theme to which the attention of the First Assembly was directed was "Man's Disorder and God's Design." It was studied by four Sections into which the Assembly divided itself, each Section dealing with one of the following four sub-topics: I. The Universal Church in God's Design. II. The Witness of the Church to God's Design. III. The Church and the Disorder of Society. IV. The Church and the International Disorder.[6] Each Section, after a thorough study of its subject, reported back to a plenary session where the statements drawn up were thoroughly scrutinized, changes made, and in a final form "received" by the Assembly and "commended to the churches for their serious consideration and appropriate action."[7]

While a study of the theme was stimulating and helpful, and commendable statements were received, the most important phase of the First Assembly's activity was the formal organization and structuring of the World Council of Churches. As H. P. Van Dusen had pointed out in the April 26, 1948 issue of Christianity and Crisis, "The one specific responsibility of the Assembly, and its major task, will be to 'bring the World Council to birth.'"[8]

There was misgiving in the minds of some American churchmen concerning the confessional representation issue. Warned Van Dusen:

> Much the most explosive issue, and one which is most likely to erupt with some sharpness on the floor of the Assembly, exists within the present membership of the Council. Strangely enough, it is an issue very largely foreign to the thinking of the overwhelming bulk of American Christians, yet is being precipitated by a small group of intensely sincere American Christians. It is the question whether the major loyalty and affiliation of any particular church, after its overarching loyalty to the Universal Church of Christ should be to neighbor churches of the same country or area, or to sister churches of the same historic family, and whether the World Council should be organized on one or the other of these bases of loyalty. It is the issue of Regionalism or Nationalism vs. Denominationalism or Confessionalism. Primary allegiance, next to

> allegiance to the world fellowship, to neighbor churches through national or regional Councils and Federations is affirmed by many of the stronger leaders of the Older Churches of the West and, almost with a single voice, by the Younger Churches of the Orient, Africa and Latin America. ... The interests of Confessionalism are being urged by some Orthodox and Anglican churchmen, by a few Reformed or Presbyterian leaders, but most convincedly and insistently by certain spokesmen of American Lutheranism. There are issues here too complex for brief treatment. The World Council leadership is suggesting that both sets of relationships--to neighbor churches and to sister churches--embody great values and that individual churches should be entirely free to take fullest advantage of both relationships.[9]

While Van Dusen correctly acknowledged the important role being played by the Lutheran churches of America in the molding of the World Council there was actually no threat of disruption. On the one hand, those who had opposed the Lutheran petition were satisfied with the compromise reached at Horsham and subsequently unanimously approved by the Provisional Committee. On the other hand, the Lutheran churches of America had already indicated that the Horsham amendment would be acceptable to them. With the power of allocation removed from area organizations, with the introduction of the requirement of adequate confessional representation and with the assurance of freedom of association along confessional lines within the framework of the World Council, theyconsidered that the conditions which they had sought were being substantially granted.[10] Some months before the convening of the First Assembly Visser 't Hooft, in a statement prepared at the request of Dr. Michelfelder, predicted overwhelming approval of the amendment.[11]

The preparatory volume and Assembly work book, Documents of the World Council of Churches, sent to delegates in the spring of 1948, included the following "commentary" on the proposed change in method of representation:

> This amendment represents the most important change which is proposed. The original constitution emphasized the principle of geographical representation. The proposed amendment does not do away with that principle, but introduces other important principles. In allocating seats in the Assembly and in distributing membership in the Central Committee, due regard will have to be given to various factors which include the confessional and geographical ones. The amendment implies that the distribution of seats in the two main bodies can be restudied from time to time in the light of new circumstances. A further change is that the members of the Central Committee are chosen by the Assembly rather than by the Churches. The advantage of this provision is that the Central Committee can begin to function immediately after or even during the Assembly. The original provision that members of the Central Committee must be persons appointed by the Churches as members of the Assembly, remains unchanged.[12]

At Amsterdam the Assembly's Committee on Constitution, Rules and Regulations, of which Wentz and Bersell were members, recommended that the amendment be approved subject to two suggested changes. The first was that the closing sentence of Section (i), paragraph 2, which provided that "these readjustments shall become effective if approved by the Central Committee and the member churches concerned," be made to read "these readjustments shall become effective if approved by the Central Committee after consultation with the churches concerned." The second was that the president or presidents of the World Council should be included in the Central Committee.[13]

Dr. Alphons Koechlin, chairman of the Committee on Constitution, Rules and Regulations, after reporting committee recommendations pointed out that only those amendments could be considered by the Assembly which had been submitted to the churches six months in advance. Thus only the amendments printed in the Documents were being proposed. Following a motion by Koechlin that the proposed amendments to the constitution be approved the chairman of the plenary session stated that a two-thirds majority vote would be required for adoption. The motion was carried unanimously.[14]

C. American Lutheran Delegates at Amsterdam Continue to Emphasize the Ecclesiastical Nature of the WCC

With the adoption of the Horsham amendment provisions for which the Lutheran churches of America had so long and persistently striven were incorporated into the constitution of the World Council. However, there was no inclination on their part to relax their vigilance with reference to the principle that membership in interchurch councils must be limited to churches and that delegates from churches should not be expected to meet on an equality with representatives of councils or federations of churches or with co-opted individuals. At Amsterdam the ULCA delegation was responsible for a resolution which further emphasized this principle.

Even though Article II of the WCC constitution provided that membership in the Council was open to "churches" which expressed agreement with the confessional basis set forth in Article I and which satisfied "such criteria as the Assembly or the Central Committee may prescribe," the provisions of Article II were not being strictly followed at Amsterdam. Among the ecclesiastical units participating in the First Assembly there were a few federations or groups of churches which had been invited by virtue of their earlier membership in Life and Work or Faith and Order. The ULCA delegation feared that the policy of the World Council might become confused at a crucial point unless the Assembly gave explicit recognition to the difficulty which existed and provision were made to proceed strictly along constitutional lines. While Article II provided that all future applications for membership would be subject to careful scrutiny there was an inclination to construe the constitution as automatically including in the membership of the Council all groups of churches which were represented at Amsterdam on the basis of official invitations. In order to assure full implementation of a basic principle the ULCA delegation proposed the following resolution to the Committee on Policy, of which Fry, Yochum and Nyholm were members:

> Resolved, That this Assembly instruct its Central Committee to review within the next year the list of groups of churches that have participated in the formation of the World Council of Churches, to confer with representatives of the groups of churches which come under consideration, and to take such action in accordance with the Constitution as it may deem appropriate in each case for revision of the list where necessary.[15]

When the Policy Committee presented the resolution at one of the plenary sessions Mr. Charles Le Quesne, delegate from the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, proposed the following addition:

> That any group of Churches in respect of whom the Central Committee may take action under this resolution shall have a right of appeal to the Assembly and further, that this Assembly instructs the Central Committee to consider what procedure should be laid down in the Constitution or in the Rules for the revision of the list of members, and to report thereon at the next Assembly.[16]

Dr. Fry replied that he would gladly accept Le Quesne's amendment. It was not the intention of the resolution to refer at all to those groups of congregations which would be considered churches under terms of the WCC constitution. Nor was it intended to remove any bona fide church from the membership roll. If there were "groups of churches" which included bona fide churches, these churches themselves should be brought into the Council. While the motion had no intention of excluding anyone, it did seek to have it clearly established that the WCC was to be composed of churches only. The ULCA initiated resolution was approved by the Assembly.[17]

On October 8, 1947 the ULCA Executive Board had voted to instruct the church's delegates to Amsterdam to press for "the application of the principle of church representation in the setting up of all departments of the World Council."[18] When documents relative to the establishment of the Youth Department came up for consideration by the First Assembly Dr. Fry objected to some of the proposals contained therein. He noted that in their present form the documents suggested the possibility that the Youth Department might be attached to regional youth organizations rather than to the churches. Insisting that the divisions and agencies of the Council must observe the principles embodied in the WCC constitution, he asked for assurance that the churches would not be by-passed. Bersell supported Fry, noting that the Youth Department was one of the explosive things in the Council while at the same time it was one of the most dynamic.[19] While there is no record that Fry was given the assurance for which he asked, he was subsequently to have a key role in the revising of the documents against which he had raised objection. The Minutes of the first meeting of the Central Committee, held immediately after the close of the Amsterdam Assembly, include the following item:

13. Constitutions of Committees and Departments

Dr. Franklin Fry reported on behalf of the sub-committee on this subject: ...

B. Documents of the Youth Department

Dr. Fry said there were three documents to be considered, which represented the basis of the Youth Department. The original papers had been radically reconstructed. The documents were: The Charter of the Youth Department, The Policy of the Youth Department, and the Constitution of the Youth Department.

The revision of the documents had been done by the Rev. D. T. Niles of the Youth Department and Dr. Fry himself, and subsequently had been scrutinised in detail by the sub-committee, and had been unanimously agreed both from the standpoint of the Youth Department and from the standpoint of the Central Committee. The principle adopted in the drawing up of these documents had been to endeavour to incorporate in the charter, the policy and the constitution of the Youth Department, those things which the young people themselves wanted, in so far as that was possible. At the same time it was desired to safeguard the two principles: (1) that the connections of the Youth Department should be first and foremost with the churches, not first and foremost with certain interdenominational movements, and (2) that the Youth Department, in dealing with the youth of the churches, should deal through the churches and not directly with segments of the churches. Dr. Fry added that he believed that all these principles had been realised in the draft under consideration, and he submitted it, with the recommendation of the Constitution Committee that the three documents be adopted.

The Committee approved these three documents.[20]

The ULCA delegates to the First Assembly, reporting back to the Executive Board of their church on September 22, 1948, expressed gratification over the character and mood of the World Council as it had emerged at Amsterdam. Confessional convictions had been treated with wholesome respect, clearly indicating that the Council did not conceive of itself as an instrument for indiscriminate unionism. Both in the Assembly and in the Central Committee there was balanced representation of the various confessional groups. When nominations for the Central Committee were reported the chairman of the Nominating Committee had emphasized that the list of names arranged by confessions was the primary one while the one giving them according to nations or geographical regions was only of a supplementary nature. The "cardinal principle" long insisted on by the ULCA, that only churches be members of interchurch councils and that only official delegates chosen by the member churches themselves be seated, had likewise been given full recognition. The churchly nature of the World Council had been firmly established. In closing their report the ULCA delegates paid tribute to Dr. Knubel and his pioneering role in behalf of the type of ecumenical organization which had emerged at Amsterdam:

> We are convinced of the validity of the principles which the honored former president of our Church, Dr. Frederick H. Knubel, advocated for the World Council from the outset of its provisional organization ten years ago and we rejoice that those principles have been so fully realized. We are humbly proud at the evident high esteem in which the United Lutheran Church is held by its sister communions. We earnestly hope that our Church will always offer its best in Christian convictions, in loyal fellowship, and in all its resources of mind and spirit to the World Council of Churches.[21]

CHAPTER XII

AN EVALUATION OF THE ROLE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA IN THE FORMATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

A. The Limited Nature Of American Lutheran Participation in Ecumenical Efforts

American Lutheran participation in ecumenical efforts of the twentieth century has been only partial and in most instances slow in coming. Only slightly more than one-half of the Lutherans of America are represented in the Lutheran bodies which are affiliated with the World Council of Churches.

No credit can be claimed by the Lutheran churches of America for the establishing of those movements which were to eventuate in the World Council. Nor did any initiative come from them for the merger which resulted in the organization of the Council. The contribution of the American Lutheran churches came only after other churches, with a greater vision of the need for promoting Christian unity and without undue apprehensiveness as to the difficulties involved, had made a beginning and had effected some kind of organization which would serve to bring the churches together. The principles for which the Lutheran churches of America successfully contended were of such a nature that an undue insistence on them in the early stages of development would have hindered and perhaps even made unlikely the emergence of ecumenical organizations. It is doubtful that the Life and Work movement would ever have gotten under way had not the practice been followed of co-opting interested individuals from among the various churches to be members, without waiting first for favorable action by the churches themselves. Even in Faith and Order, where initial insistence on official church participation was relaxed in favor of a limited amount of co-option, churchmen later to be leaders in the movement were thus introduced to the deliberations and fellowship of the World Conference.

An uncompromising insistence on the confessional principle by all churches would probably have inclined churchmen away from effective initiative in ecumenical efforts. It is fortunate that there were those who moved ahead on the premise that there was not a great difference between the churches and that there exists a Christian unity which should find organizational expression and more effective channels for witnessing and service. While the Lutheran churches of America affiliated with the World Council played a significant role in the final establishment of important principles for sound ecumenical organization, they could make their contribution only after ecumenical organizations had already been set up by interested individuals and churches which were not insistent that organization must be along certain specific lines. Had the initiative been left to the Lutheran churches of America it is not likely that the World Council or any of the earlier cooperative Christian organizations would have been organized.

An exaggerated emphasis on the confessional principle continues to keep nearly one-half of the Lutherans of America out of the World Council. The partial nature of American Lutheran participation in cooperative Christian movements is a forceful commentary on the objectionable extremes to which a basically good principle may lead. The continuing isolationism of a large portion of American Lutheranism serves to warn against the danger which is inherent in the confessional principle. At a time when Christian cooperation on the fullest possible scale is needed and at a time when a positive evangelical witness is desired and welcomed, these are being withheld. The commendable inclination of desired fidelity to the Scriptures is marred by a misapplication of Bible passages which were never meant to divide Christians from one another.

Lutheran churches of America which have refused to accept membership in the World Council have nevertheless been willing and ready to use the channels of the Council for the carrying on of much needed and admittedly well administered relief. The Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Free Church as well as practically all of the Lutheran churches of America were willing to take advantage of World Council agencies for ministering to prisoners of war and to needy Lutherans in war devastated countries. The Missouri Synod as early as 1945 gave $100,000 to the WCC for relief purposes. It is certainly a mark of inconsistency for a church to be willing to make use of benefits made possible only by the association of churches in ecumenical organizations while at the same time looking upon membership in such organizations as a "contamination" which must be avoided. The confessional principle and an emphasis on confessional loyalty must indeed be coupled with a spirit of humility and a breadth of vision lest the result be an unlovely pharisaical pride and a continued isolationism which limits the church's witness and effective service.

Turning our attention to the positive role played in the molding of the World Council by Lutheran churches of America we note that the principles for which they successfully sought practical recognition were not original with them. It was not a new idea that cooperative Christian movements should be constituted by church bodies rather than merely by individuals interested in church unity. At the "Grindelwald Conferences" held in Switzerland from 1892 to 1895 the conviction emerged that there would be no real progress toward Christian unity until churches as such would meet through officially appointed delegates.[1] Dr. Philip Schaff in an address before the 1893 meeting of the Evangelical Alliance expressed the judgment that the only church union that seemed practicable was not organic union but a federal or confederate union in which the different churches "in their official capacity" would be associated in voluntary organization.[2] The Inter-Church Conference on Federation, held in New York in 1905 as the first step leading to the formation of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, was a meeting of official representatives of churches held with official church sanction. The Federal Council itself was organized in 1908 by representatives of church bodies which had agreed to participate in its organization.[3] The World Conference on Faith and Order, initiated in 1910 by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, was set up as an organization of "Christian Communions" which confessed the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. The invitation to participate in its formation went out not to interested individuals in the various churches but to the churches themselves. Nor was the insistence on the importance of confessional subscription and on the need for frank recognition of doctrinal differences new with the Lutheran churches of America. The Faith and Order movement was launched "for the definite purpose of considering those things in which we differ" with the hope that a better understanding of one another's views of faith and order would result "in a deepened desire for reunion and in official action on the part of the separated Communions themselves."[4]

B. American Lutheran Contributions to Ecumenical Organization and Policy

Five specific contributions to ecumenical organization and policy now effective in the WCC can be attributed to the influence of American Lutherans. Some of these were carried over from Faith and Order so that their introduction or reaffirmation antedate the formation of the World Council.

(1) The policy of "receiving" rather than "adopting" reports by world conferences and assemblies, initially suggested by the ULCA delegates at Lausanne, makes it possible for the Council to speak out more freely than would be the case if reports of the Sections were adopted as official statements of doctrine or principle upon which agreement has been reached. Without overruling minority opinions or convictions by a majority vote or suggesting a consensus actually not yet achieved, conference findings and conclusions are simply received for submission to the churches for further study and possible action.

(2) The reaffirmation of the representative principle by the Faith and Order Continuation Committee in 1936 and

subsequently at Edinburgh in 1937 when the World Council was authorized served to establish the WCC as an organization comprised of churches, with members of the Assembly and Central Committee limited to official representatives of churches named by the churches themselves.

(3) The 1947 statement on the nature and purpose of the World Council, in which any intention of having the WCC be or become a world church with a central administrative authority was pointedly disavowed, was drawn up at the insistence of an American Lutheran member of the Provisional Committee.

(4) American Lutherans at Amsterdam were largely responsible for having all departments, divisions and agencies of the Council related more directly to the churches.

(5) As a result of the American Lutheran petition for confessional representation the constitution of the World Council was significantly amended.

C. Significance of the "Horsham Amendment"

1. The Utrecht Provision for Geographical Representation

Under terms of the constitution drawn up in 1938 specified numbers of seats in the Assembly and Central Committee were assigned to each of the major geographical areas, an exception being made in the case of the Orthodox churches and for minority churches under given circumstances.

Although the provisional constitution made no mention of area councils some kind of organization along geographical lines was plainly required in the functioning structure of the World Council. In England the allocating authority was placed in the hands of the British Council of Churches. In Canada a committee set up by the member churches developed into the Canadian Council. In the United States the American Committee for the World Council was constituted in 1944 as successor to the Joint Committee of the American Sections of L&W and F&O.[5] A preferred status was thus accorded to area organizations of churches such as was not given to confessional ones.

2. Reasons for American Lutheran Insistence on Confessional Representation

Lutherans of America felt that much more was at stake than the mere mechanics of assigning seats to member churches. They were convinced that the very philosophy of ecumenical organization was involved and that the World Council was being inclined and conditioned in a direction completely unacceptable. Thus from the very beginning they pushed for confessional representation, continuing to press for it even after their initial plea at Utrecht had been largely ignored. The Lutheran churches of America acted as they did for a number of reasons: (1) They interpreted the geographical method of representation as an indication that within the World Council doctrinal considerations were to be minimized and glossed over. (2) They feared that participation in area organizations dominated by extreme philosophies of ecumenicity would lead to pressures for unionistic programs and unity schemes which would compromise a sound evangelical witness. (3) They felt that geographical representation suggested the Council was to move in the direction of becoming a united world church in which area divisions would be the natural ones. (4) They doubted that American Lutherans would receive a sympathetic hearing among churches whose theology differed considerably from their own. (5) They were fearful that they would not be granted proper representation in the Council by an area organization under the influence of men unsympathetic to Lutheran views. (6) Since it was not established that every member church would have even one seat in the Assembly and it was certain that many of the smaller bodies would not have a place on the Central Committee, the American Lutheran churches could not agree to be represented indirectly by men from their area whose outlook might be in complete contradiction to their own. (7) Confessional representation seemed to them to be more in keeping with the churchly nature of the World Council. (8) They were convinced the cause of Christian unity would be best served by a frank facing of doctrinal differences in a spirit of friendliness and mutual respect, with a willingness to learn and to share, and that the position of each denominational family would be given the most effective treatment if the primary association within the framework of the WCC were along confessional lines. (9) Above all, the Lutheran churches of America wanted full assurance that the confessional principle, which insists that convictions of faith are the basic reality underlying all other considerations, would be duly recognized and respected.

Lutherans believe that since salvation is through faith alone it is a matter of primary concern what is believed and taught. While faith is far more than mere assent to a system of doctrine, the foundation upon which a Christian's trust is placed calls for the most careful attention. In order that men may place their trust in Jesus Christ, the incarnate, crucified and risen Saviour, it is imperative that the church lead men to a right knowledge of him whom the Scriptures reveal. They believe that faith, through which men are justified before God, is wrought in the hearts of men by the Holy Spirit working through the means of grace, the Word and the Sacraments. The Bible, which leads men to a knowledge of the God-man Jesus Christ, is accepted as God's Word since it is the basic channel through which God has and continues to communicate Himself to man. Jesus Christ himself is the Word--the Word made flesh. He is the revealer of the Father and as true God and true man himself the source and foundation of man's reconciliation. Through him God's plan of redemption was accomplished. The church is entrusted with a message, the "good news" of what God has done in Christ. To proclaim this Gospel is the first and foremost responsibility of the church.

The church's message indeed includes a consideration of the Christian life so that in the individual and in community the redemptive power of Christ may be made effective. A concern for social issues, however, does not require a despising or abandoning of doctrinal considerations but rather a fuller development of them so that the redemption wrought in and through Christ may be received in the fullest measure possible and that the message proclaimed by the churches may be faithful to the revealed Word as it addresses itself to the total needs of man.

3. An Inconsistency in the American Lutheran Position

When the Lutheran churches of America asked that the LWC be made the allocating agent for assigning seats in the World Council they were suggesting the violation of a fundamental principle for which they themselves had long contended, namely, that a direct line of responsibility should exist between an ecumenical organization and its member churches. Inasmuch as the LWC was not a church, but simply an agency of the Lutheran churches of the world, they were asking that an intermediate organization be interposed between themselves and the World Council. The proposal brought forward by Dr. Cavert and agreed upon at Horsham was more in keeping with the American Lutheran position than that which they requested in their petition for confessional representation.

4. Why European Lutherans Were Not So Concerned Over the Method of Representation in the WCC

Where Lutherans constituted a majority church, as in Germany, or where theirs was practically the exclusive church, as in the Scandinavian countries, there was a lack of appreciation of problems relating to ecumenical relations as faced by those in the midst of a vast multitude of denominations. For European Lutherans the practical result would have been largely the same regardless of which method of representation was employed. Even under the geographical method their association would be largely with churches of their own confession. Nor would they be subject to pressures for radical union proposals or unionistic practices which might threaten a clear confessional witness. Their nature as "Landeskirchen" or

"Volkskirchen" inclined them to look upon identification with national and cultural interests as a desirable feature rather than a danger which might easily lead to an anti-ecumenical spirit of nationalism.

5. Changes Effected by the Horsham Amendment

The Horsham amendment secured a practical recognition of the confessional principle in the functioning structure of the World Council. The principle of "geographical representation" gave way to an emphasis on "adequate geographical distribution." While on the surface it might seem that there is little if any difference between the two, the latter wording stresses with a greater degree of clarity that the WCC is not an organization comprised of geographical segments of Christendom but of churches adhering to various confessional positions. It emphasizes the fact that the basic divisions of Christendom are confessional, not geographical.

By withdrawing the power of allocation from all intermediate organizations, both area and confessional, and placing it in the hands of the primary bodies of the Council itself, all churches are included in one and the same category, the stipulated conditioning factors applying to all alike. This represents a change especially significant for the minority churches. Under terms of the Utrecht constitution it was provided that minority churches failing to receive adequate representation through channels of area allocating bodies might appeal to the Central Committee and possibly be granted places from among a small number of seats reserved for this purpose, such churches to be designated by their World confessional organizations. While assuring the minority churches at least some consideration this provision actually reduced them to a second-rate standing. Seats would be allocated to them only after they had failed to be accorded recognition and representation through the regular channels. Instead of binding the minority churches into closer fellowship with the churches of an area the practical result would have been an increasing of tensions due to failure to receive consideration. The proposal by the Lutheran churches of America that the basic allocation be made through channels of world confessional organizations would at least have enabledthe minority churches to be included on an equal footing with the larger ones. From the very start they would have had the support of their world organization rather than being accorded consideration by them only after being by-passed in the area associations. The terms of the Horsham amendment, however, are still much better than those requested by the Lutherans.

Another important change for which the Lutheran churches cannot take credit was the establishing of a direct line of responsibility between the World Council and its member churches. It is interesting to note that while Lutherans of America had earlier insisted strongly on this point it was Dr. Cavert of the Federal Council who brought forward the proposal which put it into effect.

Also, the Horsham amendment established the important principle that within the framework of the World Council there shall be complete freedom of association along whatever lines the member churches may prefer and desire. While churches will still continue to associate in area organizations of one kind or another for purposes of fellowship, study and the promotion of Council interests, they are no longer dependent on such organizations for the basic right of being represented. The additional stipulation that individual churches or groups of churches, either area or confessional, have equal initiating authority in regard to a possible readjustment of seats further emphasizes the complete freedom which now exists. As a result the WCC is more than ever a free fellowship of churches voluntarily associated for the purpose of promoting the growth of ecumenical consciousness, for cooperative study and for the facilitation of joint action.

D. The Effect of Ecumenical Movements upon the Lutheran Churches of America

The rise of interdenominational movements on a world scale helped to precipitate the formation of the Lutheran World Convention, even though this was only a minor factor. One of the reasons cited by Dr. Knubel in 1922 for the desirability of holding a world gathering of Lutherans was that a common understanding might be achieved with reference to such movements.[6]

Participation in ecumenical deliberations has resulted in a greater concern for social issues by the Lutheran churches. While Lutherans from an early time played a leading role in ministering to the unfortunate and needy there has come a greater sense of responsibility for social justice and the molding of society in keeping with Christian principles. To what extent ecumenical movements can be credited with this development it is impossible to say. One of the consequences of Lutheran participation in the Stockholm Conference was that the Copenhagen meeting of the LWC wrestled at some length with the question of the church's responsibility in dealing with social issues. This does not mean that these were neglected prior to that time. The ULCA from the beginning had a committee on moral and social questions which was succeeded later by a Board of Social Missions. Sharing in ecumenical deliberation on these matters, however, no doubt heightened the Lutheran churches' sense of responsibility in these areas. It is interesting to note that one of the leading figures in the WCC's Commission for International Affairs has been Dr. Nolde of the ULCA.

The question of ecumenical relations has had a direct effect on recent merger negotiations between certain Lutheran churches of America. The Augustana Synod withdrew from further conversations with the ALC, the ELC, the UELC and the LFC because of failure to give proper attention to the question of the merged church's affiliation with the World Council. While subsequent negotiations between those still proceeding with merger plans have led to the decision that the new body shall accept membership in the WCC on a tentative basis, there is indication that the greatest hurdle still to be cleared before a union of the churches is completed lies at this very point.

The desire of the churches having affiliated with the World Council to remain in that fellowship points to another effect which ecumenical movements have had on Lutherans in America. Participation in the Council has given them a wider vision of the Lutheran churches' responsibility. Formerly a concern for an uncompromised evangelical witness found expression in an isolationist policy. Now the same concern makes them want to bear witness and to serve on as wide a scale as possible.

Finally, membership in ecumenical organizations has made Lutherans of the world not less, but more confessional conscious. In order to communicate intelligently and intelligibly with other churches it is necessary to focus additional attention upon the Lutheran confessions. Discussions have been removed from the level of intra-family conversations, where presuppositions are taken for granted and a dialect type of terminology is employed, and are being carried on in a manner making it possible for Lutherans to communicate their convictions of faith to those unfamiliar with them. Furthermore, Lutherans have reexamined their own position to see where differences and agreements with others exist and to see whether and on what grounds the Lutheran churches must continue their separate existence. As Bishop Hanns Lilje, president of the Lutheran World Federation, has recently pointed out: "the greater amount of attention which the churches have given to the formulation of their confessional position is ... a direct result of the ecumenical renewal."[7] Lutherans who participate actively in ecumenical deliberations, activities and fellowship find themselves strengthened in their loyalty to the Lutheran confessional position.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ALC	American Lutheran Church.
AugS	Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America, since 1949 the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church.
DELC	Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, since 1952 the American Evangelical Lutheran Church [AELC].
ELC	Evangelical Lutheran Church, prior to 1946 the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America [NLCA].
F&O	Faith and Order (World Conference on Faith and Order).
IMC	International Missionary Council.
LFC	Lutheran Free Church.
L&W	Life and Work (Universal Christian Council for Life and Work).
LWC	Lutheran World Convention, since 1946 the LWF.
LWF	Lutheran World Federation, successor to the LWC.
NLC	National Lutheran Council.
NLCA	Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, since 1946 the ELC.
UELC	United Evangelical Lutheran Church, prior to 1946 the United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church.
ULCA	United Lutheran Church in America.
WCC	World Council of Churches.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. Since 1952 "The American Evangelical Lutheran Church."

2. Since 1949 "The Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church."

3. *Report of the Joint Commission to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 1913, (F&O Pamphlet No. 23), pp. 12-14.

4. AugS Minutes, 1911, pp. 36-37.

5. *Ibid.*, 1911, p. 37.

6. Conrad Bergendoff, "Lutheran Unity," *What Lutherans Are Thinking*, Edited by E. C. Fendt, The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio, pp. 368-369.

7. *General Council Minutes*, 1911, p. 13.

8. *Ibid.*, 1911, p. 24.

9. *Ibid.*, 1913, pp. 10-11.

10. *Ibid.*, 1913, pp. 227-228. In reporting the official reply of the General Council the Protestant Episcopal Commission in its *Report of the Joint Commission to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 1916 (F&O Pamphlet No. 31), pp. 5-6, the last paragraph of the General Council action is quoted. No mention, however, is made of the basic objection against placing the question of "Order" on an equal level of importance as that of "Faith."

    Members of the special committee bringing in the recommendations adopted were the Revs. G. W. Mechling, J. F. Ohl, J. A. W. Kirsch, S. G. Weiskotten, W. C. D. Keiter, E. F. Bachmann, G. E. Forsberg, Prof. C. W. Foss, and Dr. H. M. M. Richards. *General Council Minutes*, 1913, pp. 129-130, 226. The "Unity of Faith" committee authorized in the action was actually listed under the title "Committee on World Conference on Faith and Order." Membership on that committee during the 1913-15 biennium included Drs. T. E. Schmauk of Lebanon, Pa., George W. Mechling of Lancaster, Ohio, Carl E. Lindberg of Rock Island, Ill., H. E. Jacobs of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, George C. G. Haas of New York, R. F. Weidner of Maywood, Ill., C. Armand Miller of Philadelphia, Joseph Stump of Phillipsburg, N. J., Ernest P. H. Pfatteicher of Philadelphia, Prof. Ottomar Lincke of Waterloo, Ontario, Dr. H. M. M. Richards of Lebanon, Pa., and Messrs. Rrederick C. Hassold of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, E. A. Bertram of Canada, and W. S. T. Derr of Vancouver, Wash. *Ibid.*, p. 314.

11. *Ibid.*, 1915, p. 16. The Faith and Order Committee for the 1915-17 biennium was the same as above except that Dr. Weidner's name was removed (deceased) and those of Rev. E. E. Ryden of Jamestown, N. Y., and Dr. Philip Andreen of Evanston, Ill., were added. One notes also that meanwhile one of the members, Dr. Stump, had moved to Maywood, Ill. *Ibid.*, 1915, p. 321.

12. *Ibid.*, 1917, p. 20. From the 1917 Convention until the merger in 1918 the committee consisted of Drs. Schmauk, Mechling, Lindberg, H. E. Jacobs, G. C. F. Haas, Stump, Rev. Ryden and Mr. William Hager of Lancaster, Pa. *Ibid.*, 1917, p. 335.

13. *General Synod Minutes*, 1911, p. 144.

14. *Report of the Committee on Plan and Scope of the Joint Commission to Arrange for a World Conference on Faith and Order*. Adopted April 20, 1911. Published, July, 1911 (F&O Pamphlet No. 3), p. 6. The presentation at Philadelphia was by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, his presentation being published in *The Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. XLI, 1911, pp. 165-170.

15. F&O Pamphlet No. 3, pp. 7, 16. Commission consisted of the Revs. J. B. Remensnyder, M. W. Hamma, D. H. Bauslin, Pres. W. A. Granville, Judge P. S. Grosscup.

16. *A Preliminary Conference. The World Conference for the Consideration of Questions Touching Faith and Order.* Printed for the Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1913, F&O Pamphlet No. 24, pp. 7, 20, 22, 24, 28-33, 46.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 29. The representative of the Russian Orthodox Church at the meeting, the Very Rev. Alexander A. Hotovitsky, D.D., commended Dr. Remensnyder's emphasis as to the nature of the Christian life and the proper

goals for the Faith and Order movement. *Ibid*., pp. 47-48.

18. *Ibid*., p. 33.

19. *Ibid*., pp. 30-31.

20. *General Synod Minutes*, 1913, p. 29.

21. *Ibid*., 1915, p. 90.

22. The General Synod representatives at the Preparatory Conference were Drs. Remensnyder, Bauslin, Knubel, Manhart, and Singmaster. *General Synod Minutes*, 1917, p. 121. Dr. Schmauk, president of the General Council which was not represented at the Garden City Conference, reported at length on the meeting in an article appearing in *The Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. XXXV, 1916, pp. 178-186. Pamphlet No. 30 of the Pretestant Episcopal Church's Faith and Order Commission gives a report of the North American Preparatory Conference.

23. *General Synod Minutes*, 1915, p. 89.

24. An article by Dr. Remensnyder entitled "The Basic Call for the Conference on Church Unity" appears in *The Constructive Quarterly*. Edited by Silas McBee, Vol. IV, 1916, pp. 151-159.

25. T. E. Schmauk in *The Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. XXXV, 1916, pp. 181-182.

26. *General Synod Minutes*, 1917, p. 122. Cp. *North American Preparatory Conference, Garden City, Long Island, New York, U.S.A. January 4-6, 1916*. F&O Pamphlet No. 30.

27. *Ibid*., p. 12-13. Cp. *General Synod Minutes*, 1917, pp. 123-124.

28. *Ibid*., pp. 126-127.

29. *Ibid*., p. 125.

30. *Ibid*., pp. 121-128.

31. *Ibid*., p. 127.

32. *Ibid*., pp. 127-128.

33. *Ibid*., p. 128.

CHAPTER II

1. Ruth Rouse and Stephen Neill, Editors, A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1954, pp. 535-536.

2. Ibid., pp. 417-419. Cp. F&O Pamphlet No. 33: Report of the preliminary meeting at Geneva, Switzerland, August 12-20, 1920.

3. Rev. O. H. Sletten represented the Lutheran Free Church at the Stockholm Conference. Stockholm, 1925, Official Report, p. 22. At the Lausanne Conference the Lutheran Free Church was represented by T. O. Burntvedt and the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America by S. O. Sigmond. Faith and Order, Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927, pp. 511, 522. The Minutes of the Lutheran Free Church and of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America fail to reveal any authorization for such participation. In F&O Pamphlet 68, October 24, 1932, pp. 8-9 Pastor Sigmond and Pastor Burntvedt are listed as co-opted members of the World Conference on Faith and Order.

4. AugS Minutes, 1920, pp. 160-161.

5. Ibid., 1936, pp. 23-24.

6. Ibid., 1936, p. 223.

7. Ibid., 1937, pp. 33-34. Cp. Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937, pp. 291, 296, 298.

8. Ibid., p. 369.

9. F&O Pamphlet 68, pp. 8-9.

10. AugS Minutes, 1924, pp. 194-195.

11. Stockholm, 1925, Official Report, p. 22.

12. Ibid., pp. 662-668.

13. Ibid., p. 665.

14. AugS Minutes, 1926, p. 162.

15. AugS Minutes, 1936, pp. 23-24.

16. Ibid., 1937, pp. 33-34. The Oxford Conference, Official Report, pp. 284, 287.

17. At the General Synod's 1918 convention, held just prior to the first convention of the merged Church, President V. G. A. Tressler reported on correspondence with Archbishop Soederblom with reference to an invitation to participate in a projected internation Christian conference originally scheduled for April 1918. General Synod Minutes, 1918, pp. 22-23. Minutes of the 1918 conventions of the merging bodies are included as a supplement in the Minutes of the First Convention of The United Lutheran Church in America, New York, November 14-18, 1918. To fulfill legal requirements affecting the transfer of property the merged bodies continued to hold brief but official conventions until 1926.

18. ULCA Minutes, 1918, pp. 16-17.

19. Ibid., 1918, p. 17.

20. Ibid., 1918, p. 66.

21. Ibid., 1920, pp. 86-87, 455.

22. Ibid., 1920, pp. 489, 524.

23. ULCA Minutes, 1920, pp. 92-101, 455. The Washington Declaration is included in Doctrinal Declarations, A Collection of Official Statements on the Doctrinal Position of Various Lutheran Synods in America, The Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., pp. 11-19. It also appears in a little booklet, Declarations By The United Lutheran Church in America, published by the United Lutheran Church. See Appendix, pp. 296-305.

Drs. F. H. Knubel and Charles M. Jacobs constituted a special committee which drew up the Declaration for consideration by the ULCA's Executive Board. The section entitled "Concerning the Catholic Spirit of the Church" is based largely on a paper presented to a 1919 meeting of NLC leaders by Dr. Knubel. His paper "Essentials OfA Catholic Spirit," was published in The Lutheran Church Review, Vol. XXXVIII, 1919, pp. 185-197. At the 1919 and a subsequent meeting of NLC leaders certain principles were outlined by ULCA representatives who proposed that these be adopted as expressing the position of the NLC churches. These proposals, upon which the NLC leaders were unable to agree, were recast to apply particularly to the ULCA and made part of the Declaration. ULCA Minutes, 1920, pp. 449-450, 453, 453. Dr. Jacobs in an article appearing in the Jan. 1921 issue of The Lutheran Church Review, pp. 1-21, gives "an interpretation" of the Washington Declaration which is of special interest because of his role in the committee which prepared it.

Members of the "Committee on the Executive Board's Report, Divisions VIII and IX," to which the proposed Washington Declaration was referred before being presented on the floor of the 1920 convention were: Profs. C. M. Jacobs, chairman, H. E. Jacobs, J. A. Singmaster, J. E. Whitteker, H. Offerman, C. T. Benze, L. D. Reed, A. R. Wentz, E. Hoffman, F. P. Manhart, J. F. Kruger, F. Wolford, G. H. Gerberding, L. S. Keyser, J. L. Neve, D. H. Bauslin, Rev. J. C. Seegers, and Rev. B. D. Wessinger. ULCA Minutes, 1920, p. 23.

24. Ibid., p. 96.

25. Ibid., 1922, pp. 70-71.

26. Ibid., pp. 72-88, 92, 108-109.

27. Ibid., p. 88. For Knubel's letter to Westman see Appendix, pp. 333-335.

28. Ibid., pp. 88-90.

29. Ibid., p. 91.

30. Ibid., p. 93.

31. Ibid., p. 93.

32. Ibid., p. 93.

33. Ibid., pp. 93-94.

34. Ibid., pp. 109-110, 495.

35. ULCA Executive Board Minutes, Third Biennium, Jul6 9-10, 1924, p. 156; Oct. 21, 1924, pp. 160-162. At the July meeting the following motion was adopted: "Resolved, That the Executive Board believes that under certain conditions the United Lutheran Church in America might enter into these conferences and instructs its officers to

prepare a statement for presentation to the Executive Board whereby a final judgment may be reached at the Chicago Convention."

36. ULCA Minutes, 1924, p. 32.

37. Ibid., pp. 533-534. Cp. ULCA Executive Board Minutes, Third Biennium, Oct. 21, 1924, pp. 160-162.

38. ULCA Minutes, 1924, pp. 533-536.

39. Ibid., pp. 116-117.

40. Ibid., 1926, pp. 49-50. In his book, Steps Toward The World Council, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1938, pp. 92-93, Dr. Charles S. Macfarland observes that "At Stockholm no further plans were proposed than the appointment of a 'Continuation Committee.' ... This procedure was carried out with caution, because some denominational representatives at Stockholm had come almost on condition that no continuing organization should be set up." In a footnote he adds: "Particularly American Lutherans."

41. ULCA Minutes, 1926, p. 50.

42. While on the way to a reception given for the Conference by the city of Stockholm Dr. Clutz was struck by a truck as he was about to cross one of the city streets. The accident resulted in painful injuries and hospitalization. Dr. Charles S. Macfarland, in whose company he was at the time of the accident, stepped back in time to avoid being hit. He later related the details of what had happened. Having been released from the hospital, Clutz in the company of his son, had just begun his journey back to America when he died suddenly of a heart attack. Ibid., pp. 50, 63-64.

43. The Stockholm Conference 1925, Official Report, p. 758.

44. ULCA Minutes, 1926, pp. 53-64,569.

45. Ibid., p. 64.

46. Ibid., p. 65.

47. Ibid., pp. 65-75.

48. *Minutes of the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, Berne, Switzerland, August 23-25*, 1926, p. 9.

49. *Ibid*., p. 12. Cp. *ULCA Minutes, 1928*, pp. 75-76. Alexander Zabriskie notes that Bishop Brent was "far from satisfied" with the Draft Agenda, considering it to be too Anglican." Alexander C. Zabriskie, *Bishop Brent, Crusader for Christian Unity*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1948, p. 155.

50. *ULCA Minutes, 1928*, p. 76.

51. *Faith and Order, Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927*, Edited by H. N. Bate, Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York, 1928, pp. 248-257, 512, 514, 522,523.

52. *Ibid*., pp. 533-534.

53. *ULCA Minutes, 1928*, pp. 62, 77.

54. *Ibid*., *1928*, pp. 76-77.

55. *Ibid*., *1928*, p. 76.

56. *Ibid*., *1928*, p. 77.

57. *Ibid*., *1928*, pp. 77-78. *Proceedings, Lausanne, 1927*, pp. 373-375.

58. *Ibid*p,p375-376, 459-460.

59. The delegates' report included the following evaluation of the Lausanne Conference, an evaluation reflecting the general convictions of the ULCA in regard to ecumenical efforts: "It was a necessary step on the long, hard road to Christian unity. It brought to visible expression the yearning of Christendom to be one. No one could listen to the passionate pleas of the representatives of mission fields without realizing that our divisions in Western Christendom are very confusing and are hindering the work of propagating the Gospel in non-Christian lands. But it brushed aside illusions harbored here and there concerning the method by which outward unity could be realized. It pointed the only way in which the Christian Church can ever hope for a solution of its problems of

disunity, namely the calm, unhurried consideration of its fundamental tenets in a fraternal and non-controversial spirit, with the earnest hope and expectation of reaching such agreement in the unity of the Spirit as will prove to be the bond of peace, in the meanwhile giving itself earnestly to that common approach for the salvation of the world, which found unanimous approval by the Conference in its report on the Message of the Church." ULCA Minutes, 1928, p. 79.

60. Ibid., 1928, p. 79.

61. Ibid., 1928, p. 80.

62. Ibid., 1928, p. 96.

63. Ibid., 1930, pp. 65-73. Members of the commission preparing the report were Drs. Scherer, Dysinger, Greever, Steimle, and Aberly.

64. Convictions, A Selectioh From The Responses Of The Churches to the Report of the World Conference on Faith and Order Held at Lausanne in 1927, Edited by Leonard Hodgson, with the assistance of H. N. Bate and Ralph W. Brown, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1934. The ULCA's response appears on pages 165-173.

65. Quoting a sentence from Section VI of the Reports, "Ambiguous statements and hasty measures may hinder rather than hasten the work of unification," the ULCA commission's report declared: "We believe that a true, harmonious and lasting union of Churches cannot be achieved except it be with full understanding and upon a basis that is free from equivocations and ambiguities." Ibid., p. 172. Cp. ULCA Minutes, 1930, p. 72.

66. Ibid., 1930, p. 72; Convictions, pp. 172-173.

67. ULCA Minutes, 1930, p. 73.

68. Ibid., 1932, pp. 59-60.

69. Ibid., p. 60.

70. Ibid.pp60, 86. Members of the Commission for Faith and Order during the 1930-1932 biennium were Drs. Scherer, Aberly, Dysinger, Greever, and Steimle. Dr. Scherer died March 9, 1932.

71. *ULCA Minutes, 1934*, pp. 107-111. Members of the Commission during the 1932-1934 biennium were Drs. Aberly, Flack, Greever, Jacobs, Steimle, Tappert, and Wentz.

72. *Ibid.*, *1936*, pp. 82-85.

73. *F&O Pamphlet*, No. 79, p. 7.

74. *ULCA Minutes, 1936*, pp. 84-85.

75. *Ibid.*, *1934*, p. 111.

76. *Ibid.*, *1936*, p. 85.

77. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

78. *ULCA Minutes, 1938*, pp. 94-95.

79. *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 4, Oct. 1937, pp. 333-340.

80. *ULCA Minutes, 1938*, p. 97.

81. *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Held At Edinburgh, August 3-18, 1937*, Edited by Leonard Hodgson, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938, pp. 38, 293, 300, 301. Cp. *ULCA Minutes, 1938*, p. 95.

    A report by the delegates to Edinburgh appears in the *ULCA Minutes, 1938*, pp. 95-98. Reports by each of the three delegates in attendance were published in the October 1937 issue of *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, pp. 341-364. Dr. Wentz reported on the discussions and decisions of Section I, "The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ"; Dr. Flack, Section II, "The Church of Christ and the Word of God"; Dr. Steimle, Section III, "The Ministry and the Sacraments." Dr. Wentz also reported on Section IV, "The Church's Unity in Life and Worship," as well as on the Conference as a whole.

    Members of the ULCA's Commission on Faith and Order during the 1936-1938 biennium were Drs. Aberly, Flack, Greever, Jacobs, Steimle, (deceased Sept. 30, 1937) Tappert, Wentz. *ULCA Minutes, 1936*, p. 482; *Ibid.*, *1938*, p. 112.

82. Dr. Greever's absence is noted in *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order*, p. 38.

83. Members of the Committee of Sixty were Dr. J. Ross

Stevenson, chairman, Bishop Aulen, Prof. F. Gavin, Bishop J. de Wolf Perry, Bishop G. Craig Stewart, Rev. F. W. Tomkins, the Bishop of Niagara, Archbishop Dunn, Canon Hodgson, Canon Tatlow, Canon Drury, Provost Margetson, Archdeacon Monahan, the Bishop of Dornakal, the Bishop of Christchurch, N.Z., Dr. A. K. de Blois, Dr. A. J. C. Bond, Rev. Hugh Martin, Dr. H. A. Atkinson, Dr. A. E. Garvie, Dr. T. T. Lew, Rev. S. Nishida, Principal W. Robinson, Dr. W. E. Garrison, Mr. P. W. Bartlett, Dr. A. Steimle, Dr. A. R. Wentz, Pastor Christie, Bishop Fuglsang-Damgaard, Bishop Lehtonen, Baron de Bildt, Dean Brilioth, Prof. Stöckl, Prof. Menegoz, Bishop C. W. Flint, Bishop J. M. Moore, Bishop Heard, Dr. R. N. Flew, Rev. W. Eveleigh, Archimandrite Constantinides, Rev. Sergius Boulgakoff, Prof. Arseniev, Prof. Alivisatos, Dr. W. A. Brown, Dr. J. H. MacCracken, Dr. W. P. Merrill, Dr. G. W. Richards, Dr. E. F. Romig, Rev. J. S. Rutherford, Prof. G. S. Duncan, Rev. E. J. Hagen, Prof. H. Clavier, Prof. Berkelbach v. d. Sprenkel, Dr. J. C. Wissing, Dr. A. Keller, Prof. Hromadka, Prof. B. de Vasady, Principal R. Davidson, Rev. E. W. Burt, Dr. J. J. Banninga. *The Second World Conference On Faith And Order*, p. 197.

84. Members of the Committee of Thirty-Five included Jonkvrouwe C. M. van Asch van Wijck, Dr. M. E. Aubrey, Bishop James Baker, Dr. Albert W. Beaven, Dr. Marc Boegner, Dr. Yngve Brilioth, Dr. William Adams Brown, Prof. Walter T. Brown, Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, Bishop G. K. A. Bell of Chichester, Dr. J. Hutchinson Cockburn, Archbishop Germanos, Dr. Fred Goodsell, Dr. Henry-Louis Henriod, Canon Leonard Hodgson, Miss Eleanore Iredale, Dr. Alphons Koechlin, Dr. Hanns Lilje, The Rev. W. F. Lofthouse, Sir Walter Moberley, Dr. John R. Mott, Dr. Lewis S. Mudge, Bishop G. Ashton Oldham, Dr. J. H. Oldham, Dr. Hans Schonfeld, Canon Tissington Tatlow, Dr. Reinold von Thadden, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, Archbishop William Temple, Prof. Stephan Zankow, Dr. F. Zilka, and Dr. Wilhelm Zoellner. All except Drs. Lilje, von Thadden, Zilka, and Zoellner were present at the July 8-10, 1937 meeting at Westfield College, Hampstead. *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order*, pp. 192-194.

85. Copies of mimeographed reports of the Committee of Sixty are in the personal files of Dr. Wentz, Gettysburg, Members of the seven-man drafting committee were J. Ross Stevenson, chairman, Abdel Ross Wentz, secretary,

Hamilcar Alivisatos, Yngve Torgny Brilioth, Edward Arthur Dunn, Alfred Ernest Garvie and Leonard Hodgson. Mimeographed "REPORT of Committee to which the Conference has referred the Report of the COMMITTEE OF 35. 10 August, 1937," p. 2. See Appendix, pp. 313-317.

86. Information on these developments included in a letter from Dr. Floyd Tomkins to D. A. Flesner, Nov. 19, 1955. Cp. The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, pp. 192-204, 274.

87. Ibid., pp. 199, 272.

88. Letter from Dr. Tomkins to D. A. Flesner, Nov. 19, 1955. Concerning the significance of this provision Dr. Tomkins wrote in 1946: "In the case of the World Council, the original plan submitted to the Conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937 envisaged a World Council based on geographical allocation of places, and was somewhat vague about the responsibility of the Churches for appointing their representatives. It was this feature which caused objection to the plan, as was shown by the fact that all objection ceased when a different scheme was substituted by the Edinburgh Conference, namely that 'the World Council shall consist of official representatives of the Churches participating,' thus basing it squarely on denominational representation." Quoted from an article, "World Council Representation by Families of Churches, A Discussion by Floyd Tomkins, Franklin Clark Fry, Earl Frederick Adams, Ivan Lee Holt, and A. L. Warnshuis," appearing in the Summer 1946 issue of Christendom, p. 357.

89. Lutheran World Almanac, 1934-1937, p. 38.

90. Letter from Tomkins to Flesner, Nov. 19, 1955.

91. A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948, Edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen Neill, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1954, p. 703.

92. The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 273.

93. Letter from Tomkins to Flesner, Nov. 19, 1955.

94. The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, pp. 288, 305.

95. The Lutheran World Almanac, 1934-1937, p. 38. See below, p. 306.

96. Letter from Dr. Floyd W. Tomkins to D. A. Flesner, Nov. 19, 1955.

CHAPTER III

1. ULCA Minutes, 1922, pp. 92-93.

2. Osborne Hauge, Lutherans Working Together, A History of the National Lutheran Council 1918-1943, National Lutheran Council, New York, 1945, pp. 24-30.

3. Ibid., p. 38.

4. Lutheran World Almanac, 1934-1937, pp. 41-43.

5. Hauge, op. cit., p. 44.

6. Ibid., pp. 48-49.

7. E. Theodore Bachmann, Epic of Faith, The Background of the Second Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation, 1952, The National Lutheran Council, New York, 1952, p. 12.

8. The First Lutheran World Convention, Minutes and Reports, Eisenach, 1923.

9. Ibid., pp. 56-63.

10. The Second Lutheran World Convention, The Minutes, Addresses And Discussions Of The Convention, Copenhagen, Denmark, June 26th to July 4th, 1929, pp. 63-71.

11. Ibid., pp. 72-78.

12. Ibid., pp. 63-82.

13. Ibid., p. 112.

14. Ibid., p. 120.

15. Ibid., p. 204.

16. Lutheran Herald, August 26, 1947, p. 830.

17. Letter from Dr. Knubel to Dr. Wentz, June 2, 1936. In personal files of Dr. Wentz, Gettysburg. See Appendix, pp. 336-338.

18. The four members of the American Section of the Lutheran World Convention at that time were Drs. Knubel, Ralph Long, Lars W. Boe, and Wentz.

19. Correspondence in personal files of Dr. Wentz, Gettysburg: From Drs. Long to Wentz, Nov. 2, 1936; Knubel to Wentz, Dec. 4, 1936; Wentz to Knubel, Dec. 7, 1936; Knubel to Wentz, Dec. 21, 1936; Long to Wentz, Dec. 30, 1936; Wentz to Lilje, Jan. 12, 1937; Wentz to Long, Feb. 26, 1937. Difficulty seems to have been encountered at first from one of the Scandinavian members of the Executive Committee. However, after consideration of the propositions on proper relationship of Lutheran churches to ecumenical movements representatives of the "Northern Group" also gave their approval. CP. Lutheran World Almanac, 1934-1937, p. 36.

20. News Bulletin, National Lutheran Council, March 12, 1937, pp. 1-6. Cp. Lutheran World Almanac, 1934-1937, pp. 36-38. See Appendix, pp. 306-312.

21. Ibid., p. 36.

22. Ibid., pp. 36-37.

23. Ibid., p. 37.

24. Ibid., p. 37.

25. Ibid., p. 38.

26. Ibid., p. 36.

27. C, III, 3, (1)-(9) of the 1936 statement is identical with D, III, 1-9 of the Washington Declaration. ULCA Minutes, 1920, pp. 98-99; Lutheran World Almanac, 1934-1937, p. 38.

28. Cp. C,III, 3, (a) of 1936 statement with D, IV, 2 of the Washington Declaration.

29. Niederschrift über die Verhandlung des Executivkomitees des Lutherischen Weltkonvents geschehen im Kirchenratssaal der Ev. Luth. Kirche am Spui zu Amsterdam, Handboogstraat 6, vom 24. bis 28. August 1937. A copy of these

Minutes which include an official English translation of the Resolutions in regard to the World Council of Churches is in the personal files of Dr. Wentz, Gettysburg.

30. ULCA Minutes, 1938, pp. 100, 528-529.

31. Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom, 6th ed., Vol. II, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1919, pp. 62-63.

32. The Book of Concord; or, The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Translated from the Original Languages with Analyses and an Exhaustive Index, ed. Henry Eyster Jacobs, D.D., LL.D., S.T.D. (People's Edition, by Authority of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1911), p. 38.

33. Ibid., p. 367.

34. Dr. Junius Remensnyder, "The Basic Call for the World Conference on Church Unity," The Constructive Quarterly, ed. Silas McBee, Vol. IV, 1916, pp. 152-153.

35. F&O Pamphlet No. 33, p. 18.

36. Proceedings, Lausanne, 1927, p. 462.

37. The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 275.

38. The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches Held at Amsterdam August 22nd to September 4th, 1948, The Official Report, ed. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, Harper & Brothers, New York, p. 10.

CHAPTER IV

1. ULCA Minutes, 1938, pp. 97-98. Cp. The World Council of Churches, Its Process of Formation, Geneva, 1946, pp. 6-7.

2. Letter from Dr. W. A. Brown, acting president of the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work, to Dr. W. H. Greever, Oct. 14, 1937. Copy in WCC files, New York.

3. Minutes of Electoral Conference, Washington, D. C., Jan. 10, 1938, p. 1. WCC files, New York.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 3. Pages 4 and 5 of the Electoral Conference Minutes carry the following report: "Two adjourned meetings were held: the first at noon on January 11th at Satterlee Hall, in which the action with respect to referring Lutheran appointments to the National Lutheran Council was taken, as indicated above. ..."

5. *ULCA Minutes*, 1938, p. 98.

6. N*LC Minutes*, Jan. 26-27, 1938, p. 5.

7. *Ibid.*, Jan. 25-26, 1939, p. 5. A list of Americans and Canadians scheduled to attend the Utrecht conference is appended to the *Minutes of the Informal Meeting at the National Arts Club, 15 Gramercy Park, N.Y. City, April 1, 1938, 4:30-9:00 P.M. of the delegates to the Utrecht Provisional Conference*. Minutes on file at New York WCC office. Official Delegates from American Churches: Rev. Ahva J. C. Bond, D.D. (Seventh Day Baptist - representing also Southern Baptist), Rev. Graham Frank, D.D. (Disciples and Congregational-Christian), Bishop S. L. Green, D.D. (Negro Churches), Rev. Frederick H. Knubel, D.D. (United Lutheran), Prof. Kenneth Scott Latourette, S.T.M. (Northern Baptist), Rev. Ralph H. Long, D.D. (American Lutheran), Dr. John R. Mott (Methodist Episcopal), Rev. Lewis Seymour Mudge, D.D. (Presbyterian and Reformed), Rt. Rev. James deWolf Perry, D.D. (Protestant Episcopal), Dean Elbert Russell (Friends, Moravians, and small denominations). Official Delegates from Canadian Churches: Rev. R. A. Hiltz, D.C.L. (Church of England in Canada), Very Rev. George C. Pidgeon, D.D. (United Church of Canada). Eastern Orthodox Delegate: Father John Trutia. Lay Delegates: Mr. Andrew H. Phelps (Methodist Episcopal), Dr. John H. MacCracken (Presbyterian), Mrs. Henry Hill Pierce (Protestant Episcopal). World Sunday School Association: Dean Luther A. Weigle, D.D. News Service: Rev. Robert A. Ashworth, D.D. American Members of Committee of Fourteen: Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., Rt. Rev. George Craig Stewart, D.D., Rev. William Adams Brown, D.D., Rev. Samuel McCrea Cavert, D.D., American Section - Universal Christian Council: Rev. Henry Smith Leiper, D.D.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 1. Those present at the April 1, 1938 meeting were Drs. Ashworth, Cavert, Frank, Knubel, MacCracken, Mott, Mudge, Stevenson, Weigle, Leiper, Prof. Latourette, and Father Trutia.

9. *Memorandum on World Council of Churches adopted by the Administrative Committee of the Baptist World Alliance at its session in London, January 31, 1938*, pp. 1-2. See Appendix, pp. 338-339.
10. *Ibid*., p. 2.
11. *Minutes of the Informal Meeting ... April 1, 1938, of the delegates to the Utrecht Provisional Conference*, pp. 1-2.
12. *Ibid*., pp. 1-2.
13. *WCC, Its Process of Formation*, Geneva, 1946, p. 7.
14. William Adams Brown, *Toward A United Church*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946, p. 148.
15. *Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on the Arrangements for the Assembly, The World Council of Churches, St. Julians, Horsham, July 31st - August 1st, 1946*. p. 14.
16. *WCC, Its Process of Formation*, Geneva, 1946, pp. 174-179. Cp. Appendix, pp. 318-320.

CHAPTER V

1. *AugS Minutes, 1938*, pp. 16-17.
2. *Ibid*., p. 18.
3. *Ibid*., *1939*, p. 26. No further action seems to have been taken by this committee of presidents. It was to be at the invitation of the ULCA that representatives of Lutheran churches of America were to meet in Columbus, 1945 for achieving a common understanding in regard to the WCC.
4. *Ibid*., *1939*, p. 284. A copy of the official invitation to join the WCC as well as a copy of the WCC constitution is reproduced in full. *Ibid*., pp. 36-44.
5. *Ibid*., *1940*, p. 204. On June 14, 1940, Dr. Bergendoff, secretary of the Synod's Committee on Reference and Comity, wrote to Dr. Floyd Tomkins reporting the action of the Synod, a copy of which action was enclosed. Copy of

letter and Synod action in WCC files, New York. The 1940 convention also designated Dr. Bersell to be the Synod's official representative to the WCC with Dr. C. A. Lund as alternate.

6. Copy of letter sent out by St. Paul Ministers Association in files of WCC, New York.

7. Dr. Bersell's letter, dated March 6, 1941, in WCC files, New York. In his president's message to his church's 1937 convention Dr. Bersell had called attention to the binding nature of the Minneapolis Theses, to which the Augustana Synod along with the American Lutheran Church, the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, the Lutheran Free Church, and the United Danish Lutheran Church had subscribed when in 1930 they had joined to form the American Lutheran Conference. He reminded the 1937 convention that these Theses, which rejected "all unionism and syncretism," constituted "a holy covenant into which we as a Synod have entered together with four other Lutheran general bodies. We must respect this concordat, for it is not only a promise given to brethren, it is also an expression of our faith." AugS Minutes, 1937, p.20. The Minneapolis Theses were reproduced in full in the 1937 Minutes, pp. 40-42.

8. Letter from Bersell to Leiper, March 6, 1941, in WCC files, New York.

9. Letter from Bersell to Leiper, March 13, 1941, in WCC files, New York.

10. Copy of letter from Leiper to Bersell, March 18, 1941, in WCC files, New York.

11. In his letter to the St. Paul Ministers Association Dr. Leiper referred not only to Dr. Bersell's objection to the ecumenical worship service, but noted also that reports had reached his office commending the service. He pointed out, however, that the Provisional Committee of the WCC would not, and could not, take any action which would be against the established rules and practices of the constituent bodies. He noted that the Joint Executive Committee, upon which rested the responsibility for promoting the World Council in America, had endorsed the holding of "ecumanical" services as a means of strengthening the inner unity of the Church and the developing among American Christians a sense of their membership in

a world-wide community, and had authorized the issuance of a Primer of ecumenical worship and the promotion of services such as held in St. Paul. He added, however, that the Joint Executive Committee would not for a moment promote any activity which would offend the sense of propriety of any of its constituent bodies. He cautioned that membership in the World Council by any church body should not be used in such a way as to bring pressure upon local churches, especially in regard to matters in which there is a difference of attitude and practice. Copy of communication to the St. Paul Ministers Association, Rev. William D. Powell, Secretary, is in the WCC files, New York.

Dr. Wentz, in commenting on the St. Paul incident, pointed out to Dr. Leiper that Lutherans are opposed to the "stagey" aspect of unionistic endeavors. While many will participate in union efforts and services up to a point, they cannot go along when such services are held as a "show" or a "demonstration of unity or union." Letter from Wentz to Leiper, March 13, 1941, in WCC files, New York.

12. The AugS was represented at Toronto by Drs. Conrad Bergendoff, C. A. Lund, and E. E. Ryden. AugS Minutes, 1941, p. 253. Cp. ULCA Minutes, 1942, pp. 137-138. See below pp. 107-108.

13. Copy of Bersell's June 18, 1941 letter to Dr. Tomkins in WCC files, New York.

14. Letter from Leiper to Bersell, June 23, 1941, in WCC files, New York.

15. Ivan Lee Holt, "Christian Fellowship in the Americas" in Christendom, Vol. VII, No. 1, Winter, 1942, p. 23.

16. Ernest W. Meyer, "Grounds and Conditions of a Christian Peace," Christendom, Vol. VI, No. 3, pp. xi, 323.

17. AugS Minutes, 1941, p. 253. Members of the Commission on Comity were Drs. P. O. Bersell, C. Albert Lund, E. E. Ryden, and Conrad Bergendoff.

18. Ibid., 1942, p. 236.

19. Ibid., 1944, p. 22. A copy of the Plan for Reorganization appears on pp. 311-314.

20. Ibid., 1945, p. 15. See pp. 120-122 of thesis.

21. *Ibid*., p. 15.

22. *ULCA Minutes, 1938*, pp. 95-100. *ULCA Executive Board Minutes*, Oct. 14, 1937, p. 39.

23. *ULCA Minutes, 1938*, p. 96.

24. *Ibid*., p. 101.

25. *Ibid*., p. 483.

26. Letter from Knubel to Leiper, Sept. 10, 1940, in WCC files, New York.

27. Letter from Leiper to Knubel, Sept. 12, 1940, in WCC files, New York.

28. *ULCA Minutes, 1940*, pp. 111, 147.

29. *ULCA Minutes, 1942*, 128-135, 292, 478-479.

30. *Ibid*., p. 136.

31. *Ibid*., pp. 137-138. Dr. Wentz officially represented the ULCA at the Toronto Conference.

32. Letter from Wentz to Leiper, April 10, 1943, in WCC files, New York.

33. *ULCA Minutes, 1942*, p. 138.

34. *Ibid*., pp. 135, 547.

35. *Ibid*., *1944*, p. 119. Memorandum from Dr. Harold Fey to Dr. Leiper, Oct. 24, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

36. *Ibid*., p. 119.

37. *Ibid*., p. 120. The Church's Commissioners to the World Conference on Faith and Order during the 1942-1944 biennium were Drs. Flack, Greever, and Wentz.

38. Copy of letter from Leiper to Fry, Jan. 8, 1945, in WCC files, New York. Special reference was made to the request by the Geneva office of the World Council that Stewart Herman be assigned to their staff. It was suggested that possibly the ULCA might want to help with

the financing of his appointment, especially in view of the fact that the financial cooperation of the ULCA with the World Council had thus far been "on a nominal level" proportionately far below that of other bodies related to the World Council. It was added, however, that if financial assistance were out of the question it was nevertheless desirable that the ULCA be agreeable to the desired appointment.

Dr. Leiper proceeded on the assumption that the ULCA had already accepted membership in the World Council, which, as already noted, was far from the case. The only connection the ULCA had with the WCC at this time was through the World Conference on Faith and Order to which it was officially related and to which the Church made an annual appropriation.

39. Copy of letter from Leiper to Fry, Jan. 16, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

40. Copy of letter from Leiper to John R. Mott, Jan. 16, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

41. Letter from Fry to Leiper, Jan. 30, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

42. *ULCA Minutes, 1946*, p. 229, The commissioners for the 1944-1946 biennium were Drs. W. H. Greever, E. E. Flack, F. C. Fry, C. E. Krumbholz, O. F. Nolde, John Schmieder, and A. R. Wentz.

43. Letter from Dr. Wentz to Miss Eleanor Kent Brown, April 28, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

44. Copy of letter from Miss Eleanor Kent Brown to Dr. Wentz, May 4, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

45. Copy of letter from Leiper to Fry, April 23, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

46. Copy of letter from Leiper to Poppen, March 24, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

47. Letter from Poppen to Leiper, April 6, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

48. Copy of letter from Leiper to Long, April 17, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

49. Letter from Long to Leiper, April 24, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

50. Copy of letter from Leiper to Poppen, April 25, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

51. Letter from Poppen to Leiper, May 15, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

52. Copy of letter from Leiper to Poppen, May 22, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

53. Pre-Convention Bulletin, ALC, 1944, p. 20.

54. Copy of letter from Leiper to Poppen, Sept. 19, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

55. Letter from Poppen to Leiper, Sept. 21, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

56. Copy of letter from Leiper to Poppen, Sept. 26, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

57. ALC Minutes, 1944, pp. 21, 87.

58. Letter from Poppen to Leiper, Oct. 26, 1944, in WCC files, New York.

59. Letter from Poppen to Leiper, Feb. 14, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

CHAPTER VI

1. In Jan. 1944 the American Section, as an emergency measure, had enlarged the Committee to 8 members in order to give wider representation. Four new members had been added: Drs. Theodore G. Tappert, ULCA; Ethan Mengers, United Danish Luth. Church; P. O. Bersell, Augustana Synod; J. Wargelin, Finnish Suomi Synod. These together with the 4 American members of the LWC Executive Committee, Drs. Knubel, Long, Aasgaard, and Wentz, then constituted the American Section of the Executive Committee. ULCA Minutes, 1944, pp. 242-243.

The five-fold purpose of their trip was: "First, to observe and evaluate conditions, to learn as much as possible of the state of the Lutheran churches and their needs. ... Second, to contact as many Lutheran church leaders as possible in order to set in motion and implement a world-wide program of Lutheran action looking to the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the Lutheran Church and its work in all lands. Third, to contact other Christian leaders, especially the World Council of Churches' Reconstruction Committee in Geneva for the purpose of coordinating and integrating this work of the Lutheran Church with the work of other churches that are also ready to launch out on great reconstructive and eleemosynary programs, involving the expenditure of millions of dollars. ... Fourth, to contact United States Army and Navy chaplains, their chiefs and staffs, for the purpose of extending as widely as possible our American Lutheran ministry to our servicemen abroad. ... Fifth, to contact those in charge of the prisoners of war work on the continent and in England, namely, the civilian organizations such as the Y.M.C.A., and the World Council of Churches, and the military command, for the purpose of learning how our American Lutheran Commission for prisoners of War can best cooperate in this service wherein we have already given such a large contribution." Lutheran Standard, May 19, 1945, p. 14. Report on trip by Dr. Bersell.

2. Ibid., p. 14, Cp. Lutheran Companion, March 23, 1955, pp. 8-9, in which Dr. Bersell after ten years recalls important events of their 1945 trip to Europe.

3. A report on the Sigtuna meeting is given by Dr. Bersell in his article in the Lutheran Companion, March 23, 1955, pp. 8-9. Note difference in spelling of Borgveall's name in footnote 5 below.

4. Ibid., pp. 8-9.

5. Drs. Long and Fry were later elected members of this European Liaison Committee to serve along with Bishop Rodhe and Director Thore Borgvall of Sweden. Lutheran Standard, May 19, 1945, p. 14. Dr. S. C. Michelfelder was later to become director of its activities.

6. Lutheran Companion, March 23, 1955, p. 9.

7. Lutheran Standard, May 12, 1945, p. 15. The April 2, 1945 Minutes of the meeting in Geneva are reproduced in this issue.

8. ULCA Minutes, 1944, p. 244. Lutheran Standard, May 19, 1945, p. 14. The agreement between the Missouri Synod

and the American Section reached in 1944 was reaffirmed on April 18, 1945 by the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we affirm a disposition on the part of the American Section of the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention and the representatives of the Missouri Synod to work together in the Christian and especially the Lutheran responsibility for postwar reconstruction in Europe, in all such projects mutually agreed upon, without the violation of principles by either group.

"It is agreed that there shall be mutual consultation in regard to individual major actions on the part of either group aside from the common work of both groups in order to assure harmonious cooperation and integration of effort."

The sailing of Drs. Michelfelder and Herman was reported by Dr. Long in the Information and Communication Bulletin issued by the American Section of the LWC Executive Committee, July 6, 1945.

9. Dr. Michelfelder was to help organize the Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid of the WCC and to serve as the first director of its Material Aid Division. He represented the American and Swedish Joint Liaison Committee to the WCC as well as being Commissioner of the American Section and of the NLC in charge of the distribution of funds and relief supplies. From July 1946 until his death in 1951 he was to be Executive Secretary of the LWC and of its successor, from 1947, of the LWF. E. Theodore Bachmann, Epic of Faith, 1952, pp. 18-23. The Minutes and Reports of the World Council's Provisional Committee Meeting held in Geneva, Feb. 21-23, 1945, carry the following item: "We wish to record with deep gratitude that several American Churches have offered the services of secretaries whose work has already proved to be of the greatest importance. We mention especially the name of Dr. Michelfelder who has taken the initiative in the creation of the Division for Material Aid and who represents among us both the American Lutheran Churches and the Lutheran World Convention." The WCC, Its Process of Formation, 1946, p. 61.

Stewart Herman was to serve as a secretary of the WCC staff, later as assistant director of the WCC's Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid, and then as head of the vast Refugee Resettlement Program of the LWF. Bachmann, op. cit., p. 21. The WCC, Its

Process of Formation, 1946, p. 61; Lutheran Standard, May 24, 1947, p. 4.

CHAPTER VII

1. Minutes of the ULCA Executive Board, July 12, 1945, p. 137. Cp. ULCA Minutes, 1946, p. 219.

2. Letter from Fry to Wentz, Aug. 3, 1945, in files of Dr. Wentz, Gettysburg.

3. Letter from Fry to Leiper, July 17, 1945; copy of letter from Leiper to Fry, July 23, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

4. Letter from Fry to Leiper, July 24, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

5. Letter from Fry to Leiper, Aug. 3, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

6. Copy of letter from Leiper to Fry, Aug. 23, 1945, in WCC files, New York.

7. Invitations had been sent to the NLC churches and the Missouri Synod. All sent official representatives to the Columbus meeting. Representing the ALC were its president, Dr. Emmanuel Poppen and two vice presidents, Dr. William G. Sodt and Dr. H, L. Yochum; the Danish Ev. Lutheran, its president, Dr. Alfred Jensen; the Missouri Synod, Dr. J. W. Behnken, president, and two vice presidents, Dr. H. Harms and Dr. Henry A. Grueber; the Augustana Synod, Dr. P. O. Bersell, president, Dr. Oscar A. Benson, vice president, and Pastor S. E. Engstrom; the LFC, Dr. T. O. Burntvedt, president; the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, Dr. J. A. Aasgaard, president; the Suomi Synod, Dr. Alfred Haapanen, president, and Dr. John Wargelin; the UELC, Dr. N. C. Carlsen, president; the ULCA, Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, president, Dr. T. G. Tappert and Dr. A. R. Wentz. ULCA Minutes, 1946, pp. 219-220.

8. UELC Minutes, 1946, p. 15.

9. Quoted in ULCA Minutes, 1946, pp. 221-222.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 221.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 222.

12. *Christendom*, Vol. IX, No. 3, Summer 1946, p. 360.

CHAPTER VIII

1. *Lutheran Standard*, Dec. 1, 1945, p. 10.

2. Letter from Long to Wentz, Nov. 5, 1945, in personal files of Dr. Wentz, Gettysburg. Dr. Aasgaard had succeeded Dr. L. W. Boe following the latter's death in Dec. 1942. *ULCA Minutes*, *1944*, p. 242.

3. Copy of letter from Wentz to Long, Nov. 6, 1945, in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

4. Handwritten letter from Fry to Wentz, written from Geneva, Switzerland where the former was in consultation with WCC leaders, in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

5. Held in Waldenburg, Saxony. *ULCA Minutes*, *1940*, p. 443.

6. Two representatives from America had been prepared to go to this meeting. *Ibid.*, p. 445.

7. *The Christian Century*, Feb. 13, 1946, pp. 211-212, carries a news item by K. E. Jordt Jorgensen, the item having been written from Roskilde, Denmark, Dec. 22, 1945.

   The NLC news release published in the Dec. 1, 1945 issue of the *Lutheran Standard* reported that the meeting was to be held in Copenhagen on Dec. 13-14. This was evidently the date which had been suggested in the American request for a meeting. Fry in his Dec. 7 letter to Wentz reported that the meeting was now finally scheduled for Dec. 15 and 16. The Dec. 12, 1945 issue of *The Lutheran*, however, reported that a cable from Long had reached this country stating that the meeting was to take place Dec. 16-17. *The Lutheran*, Jan. 9, 1946, pp. 8-9, reported that "The first meeting of the executive Committee of the LWC since 1939 began Sunday afternoon, December 16, in an assembly room of the Copenhagen KFUK."

8. Reported by Fry in his Dec. 7, 1945 letter to Wentz, in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg. The Nov. 27 date

is given in The Lutheran, Dec. 26, 1945, p. 4.

9. The Christian Century, Feb. 13, 1946, p. 211. Cp. The Lutheran, Jan. 2, 1946, p. 4. Dr. Michelfelder succeeded Dr. Hanns Lilje of Hannover, Germany who had also submitted his resignation.

10. Following the reorganization of the Executive Committee the Copenhagen meeting considered at great length the urgent problem of relief to war-devasted countries. Attention was given to the world-wide mission program of the Lutheran Church with special reference to the Lutheran mission fields orphaned by the war. A letter from Bishop Meiser relative to a plan for building up a union of the different churches of Germany was read. The possibility of an expanded program of seminary training for Lutheran pastors was discussed, and action was taken on the proposal by the Lutheran churches of America that the WCC be petitioned to establish representation in the Council on a confessional basis. A good summary of these deliberations appeared in a report of the meeting by K. E. Jordt Jorgensen in The Christian Century, Feb. 13, 1946, pp. 211-212.

11. Minutes of the American Section of the Executive Committee of the LWC, Chicago, Illinois, March 22, 1946, p. 3.

12. Reported in letter from Fry to Wentz, Dec. 7, 1945, in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

13. The account of the Dec. 8, 1945 meeting between Fry, Visser 't Hooft, Cavert, Cockburn, and Boegner is based on the typed copy of a report of the meeting. In Wentz's personal files, Gettysburg.

14. Copy of letter from Visser 't Hooft to Fry, Jan. 21, 1946, in which Fry's letter and his sending a copy of the Sept. 6th Minutes are acknowledged in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg. Wentz and Bersell attended Geneva meeting.

15. The first meeting of the Provisional Committee had been held at Utrecht on May 13, 1938, immediately following the May 9-12 conference which drew up the provisional constitution for the WCC and which had agreed that a Provisional Committee should be formed, consisting of the members of the Committee of Fourteen and their alternates and a few additional members which the Administrative

Committee of Life and Work and the Continuation Committee of Faith and Order might appoint. At the May 13, 1938 meeting Archbishop William Temple had been elected chairman of the Provisional Committee and an Administrative Committee had been appointed with Dr. Marc Boegner as chairman. *The WCC, Its Process of Formation*, 1946, p.7. A second meeting had been held at St. Germain in Jan. 1939, at which time it had been provisionally decided to fix August 1941 as the date of the first Assembly; the action of the Madras Conference had been reported and approved; plans made for an ecumenical journal; and it had been decided to appoint a special officer for the coordination of the work of the churches on behalf of refugees. Pursuant to this action, in Feb. 1939, Dr. Adolf Freudenburg had been added to the staff of the General Secretariat as Secretary for Refugees' Affairs. *Ibid.*, p. 9, 158. Also at the Jan. 1939 meeting of the full Provisional Committee it had been decided to call (in cooperation with the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches) a conference of experts to consider what action might possibly be taken in an effort to check the drift towards war and toward the establishing of an effective international order. This conference had been held in July 1939, its findings submitted to the Administrative Committee at its meeting in Zeist, Holland later in July and subsequently sent out to the churches with a covering letter. The Provisional Committee also had a considerable share in the World Conference of Christian Youth held at Amsterdam July 24-August 2, 1939. The Administrative Committee had still held a well-attended meeting in Holland in Jan. 1940, after which no fully representative meetings could be held until in 1946. Meanwhile members of the Provisional Committee had continued to meet in geographical groups, especially in the U.S.A., Britain, and at Geneva. In 1942 and 1945 these groups had been brought into personal contact through visits of American delegates to Europe and Britain, of European delegates to Britain and America, and of British delegates to America. Work at the Geneva headquarters of the WCC had increased rapidly during the war, as a ministry to prisoners of war and refugees had been extended, communications between churches of the warring nations maintained, and tasks such as Bible distribution and church reconstruction had been undertaken. In 1942, on the occasion of Cavert's visit to Geneva, foundations had been laid for what was later to become the Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid.

Ibid., pp. 9-12. At meetings in New York and London in the spring and summer of 1945 it had been decided to call the Provisional Committee together early in 1946. Ibid., p. 13.

Dr. Leiper, in a telegram to Visser 't Hooft on July 17, 1945, reported that careful consultations with Mott, Taft, Wentz, Decker, and Cavert indicated that late Feb. 1946 would be the best time for a Provisional Committee meeting. In the same telegram Leiper had expressed [illegible] that the LWC might meet at the same time since such a meeting would afford exceptional opportunities for conversations. Copy of telegram in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

Wentz in a letter to Fry on Aug. 10, 1945 reported that he had been notified by Leiper the previous evening of a cable from Geneva in which notification had been given that the date for the Provisional Committee meeting had been definitely set for Feb. 20-24, 1946. Copy of Wentz's letter to Fry in personal files of Wentz.

A meeting of the Interim Committee of the International Missionary Council was held in Geneva, Feb. 16-19, 1946, with a series of meetings of the Joint Committee of the IMC and the WCC having preceded it, starting on Feb. 14. On Feb. 20 delegates of the IMC and WCC met for an "Ecumenical Consultation." In the afternoon they shared a special welcome by the Swiss government and in the evening they participated jointly in an ecumenical service in the Cathedral. The WCC, Its Process of Formation, 1946, p. 14.

16. Prior to the meeting a "Memorandum on Proposal for Confessional Representation" had been prepared for the information of the members of the Provisional Committee. It is filed under "Prov. Ctee. 46 - 11" See Appendix, pp. 322-324.

17. A hand-written copy of Wentz's presentation in his personal files, Gettysburg. His "brief" in behalf of confessional representation is quoted in full by Fry in his discussion of "World Council Representation By Families Of Churches," Christendom, Vol. XI, No. 3, Summer 1946, pp. 360-362. See Appendix, pp. 340-343.

18. A. R. Wentz, "Lutheran Churches and the Modern Ecumenical Movement" in World Lutheranism of Today, 1950, p. 409.

19. The WCC, Its Process of Formation, 1946, p. 53. Wentz was a member of the Committee on Arrangements to which

the American Lutheran proposal was referred. *Ibid.*, p.196. For Minute on February 1946 action see Appendix, p. 324.

20. Two page memorandum of Wentz's conversation with Visser 't Hooft, Feb. 27, 1946, in Wentz's personal files, Gettysburg.

21. "World Council Representation By Families Of Churches," A Discussion by Floyd Tomkins, Franklin Clark Fry, Earl Frederick Adams, Ivan Lee Holt, and A. L. Warnshuis, *Christendom*, Vol. XI, No. 3, Summer 1946, pp. 356-372. Adams' presentation on pp. 363-366.

22. *Christianity and Crisis*, Vol. VIII, No. 7, April 26, 1948, p. 49.

23. *Christendom*, Vol. XI, No. 3, Summer 1946, pp. 37-372.

24. *Minutes of the Meeting of the American Section of the Lutheran World Convention, March 22, 1946*, pp. 4-5.

25. Copy of letter from Wentz to Aasgaard, March 26, 1946, in Wentz's personal files, Gettysburg.

26. Copies of letters from Wentz to Aasgaard, Fry, and Long, April 8, 1946 and April 18, 1946, in Wentz's personal files, Gettysburg.

27. In his letter of April 18th Wentz suggested that the enclosures be included with the communication to the Lutheran churches of the world.

28. Copy of letter from Johannes J. Stolz to The Executive of the Lutheran World Convention, Uppsala, Sweden, c/o its Acting Executive Secretary, Dr. S. Michelfelder, Geneva, June 17, 1946, in Wentz's personal files, Gettysburg.

29. Copy of letter from J. P. van Heest to Eidem, June 28, 1946, in Wentz's personal files, Gettysburg.

30. Copy of letter from Wheatcroft to Eidem, July 1, 1946, in Wentz's personal files, Gettysburg.

31. Copy of Jan Szeruda's letter to Eidem, July 10, 1946, in Wentz's personal files, Gettysburg.

32. *The Lutheran*, Aug. 7, 1946, p. 4; Aug. 14, 1946, pp. 4-6, 50; Sept. 4, 1946, p. 7. *The Christian Century*, p. 1128,

K. E. Jordt Jörgensen of Denmark reporting. Members of the Executive Committee present at Uppsala were Dr. Alfred Jörgensen of Denmark, Bishop Max Bonsdorff of Finland, Prof. Olaf Moe of Norway, Archbishop Eidem of Sweden, Bishop Meiser of Germany, Drs. Aasgaard, Fry, Long, and Wentz of the U.S.A. Meiser arrived on the last day of the meeting. Dr. Karl Ihmels and Prof. Ernst Sommerlath, unable to get out of the Russian zone in time for the sessions, arrived in Sweden the day after the meeting and conferred with the American delegates who were still in Uppsala.

In addition the following were also present at the meeting: Bishop, Rodhe, Prof. Anders Nygren, Dean Newan and Director Johansson of Sweden and Drs. S. C. Michelfelder, Clifford A. Nelson, and Julius Bodensieck of the U.S.A.

33. Franklin Clark Fry, "A Crisis in Lutheranism," The Lutheran Outlook, Jan. 1947, pp. 7-8. The article, a brief synopsis of an address delivered by Fry before the American Lutheran Conference meeting which had been held at Rockford, Ill., Nov. 13-15, 1946, was prepared by him at the request of the editor of The Lutheran Outlook.

In the Summer 1946 issue of Christendom Fry had commented as follows on the petition in behalf of confessional representation which had been presented at Geneva by Wentz:

"As honest friends of the World Council, we want the World Council to be grounded on the strongest existing realities. That will add to its stability and power. For us those strongest existing realities outside of our individual Churches are the ties which unite us with our fellow-confessors of the Augsburg Confession all over the world. Our primary Christian loyalties are not geographical but confessional. That fact may make us seem unique in American Protestantism but we respectfully ask that it be recognized for the World Council's own good.

"We believe that European and American Christians will have so much to say to one another that it will justify many contacts. For fullest effectiveness, those contacts should be encouraged by the World Council not only at the international, interdenominational level but at the international, intraconfessional level also. A double forum and a double intimacy are far better than merely a single one. Alert Christians acknowledge that that self-conscious nationalism is one of the perils to the future. The World Council will show wise statesmanship to sanction and even to encourage a tightening of all available bonds among the continents.

"We vote resoundingly for confessional representation." Ibid., p. 363.

34. The Lutheran, Aug. 14, 1946, p. 4. A typewritten copy of "Bishop Berggrav's Memorandum Concerning Confessional Representation" "written by Pastor Henrik Hauge after discussion with Bishop Berggrav and dated Oslo, June 29, 1946" is in the personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg. **See Appendix, pp. 343-345.**

35. The Lutheran, Aug. 14, 1946, p. 5.

36. Ibid., p. 5.

37. Ibid., p. 5.

38. Ibid., p. 6.

39. Handwritten notes made during the meeting by Wentz, in the personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

40. The Lutheran, Aug. 14, 1946, pp. 5-6.

41. The Lutheran Outlook, Jan. 1947, p. 8. Cp. Wentz's handwritten notes of Uppsalla meeting, in the personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

42. Wentz's handwritten notes of Uppsalla meeting, in the personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

43. The Lutheran, Aug. 14, 1946, p. 6. Fry later viewed the action at Uppsala as "an epochal vistory for world Lutheran unity": "July 25, 1946, was one of those pivots on which history is swung. Although the future recorder may not have the acumen or the information to detect it, it was a decisive date for ecumenical Lutheranism. A momentous issue was in the balance at Uppsala. The Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention had been meeting affably. Now it had to make up its mind. Should the Lutheran Churches of the world adopt a common stand in relation to the emerging World Council of Churches? A more powerful Lutheran unity or a potential cleavage waited on the choice. The verdict on that day would affect the future decisively. ... The glory of the achievement in Uppsala was that Lutheran solidarity was not

only preserved, it was mightily buttressed and extended. ... An epochal victory for world Lutheran unity had been won." The Lutheran Outlook, Jan. 1947, pp. 7-8.

44. Present at the Horsham meeting were Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, secretary, Mrs. Kathleen Bliss, Dr. Alphons Koechlin, Dr. A. R. Wentz, Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, Prof. John Bennett, Bishop Stephen Neill, Dr. J. H. Oldham, Bishop Baker, Prof. H. Alivisatos, the Rev. Oliver S. Tomkins, the Rev. Nils Ehrenström, and Dr. Henry Smith Leiper. Copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on the Arrangements for the Assembly, St. Julians, Horsham, July 31st - August 1st, 1946, in WCC files, New York. See Appendix, pp. 325-330.

45. Ibid., p. 11.

46. Ibid., p. 11.

47. Ibid., pp. 11-12.

48. Ibid., p. 12.

49. Ibid., p. 13.

50. Ibid., pp. 14-15.

51. Ibid., p. 14.

52. Ibid., p. 15.

53. Handprinted copy of telegram from Wentz to Michelfelder, Aug. 1, 1946, in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg. Between the time that Dr. Wentz presented the Lutheran petition to the Provisional Committee in Feb. 1946 and to the Committee on Arrangements at the end of July his life was twice miraculously spared. On June 5 he escaped unhurt from the tragic LaSalle Hotel fire in Chicago which took many lives. While in Uppsala the following month for the LWC Executive Committee meeting he again escaped injury when he was accidently caught between two street cars going in opposite directions. The first escape came while attending a meeting of the ULCA Board of Foreign Missions, of which he was president. Awakened by screams he went into the smoke-filled hall where he happened to find the fire escape. He descended the ten flights on the iron grill treads barefoot, pajama clad,

without glasses or wallet. The Lutheran, June 19, 1946, p. 35. Dr. Michelfelder in a letter to Wentz following the fire said he just could not get him out of his mind and expressed deep gratitude that his life had been spared. Wentz, in replying appreciatively, observed that the Lord must have some work which He still wanted him to do. And indeed great tasks still lay ahead. Correspondence between Michelfelder and Wentz in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

54. Letter from Eidem to Wentz, Aug. 7, 1946, in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

55. Minutes and Reports of the Meeting of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches, Buck Hill Falls, Penn., April 1947, pp. 92-94.

CHAPTER IX

1. Correspondence between Fry and Wentz, Sept. 1946, in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

2. ULCA Minutes, 1946, pp. 229-230.

3. Ibid., 1948, pp. 254-255.

4. Ibid., 1948, p. 256.

5. Ibid., 1948, p. 251.

6. Ibid., 1948, pp. 258-260.

7. Ibid., 1948, pp. 255-256.

8. Ibid., 1948, p. 256.

9. Quoted in ULCA Minutes, 1946, p. 222.

10. Copy of resolutions in WCC files, New York.

11. Letters from Leiper to Yochum and Poppen, Oct. 31, 1945, WCC files, New York.

12. ALC Minutes, 1946, p. 28.

13. Letter from Leiper to Wentz, in Wentz's personal files, Gettysburg.

14. *ALC Minutes, 1948*, p. 60.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 23. Cp. *Lutheran Standard*, April 10, 1948, p. 5.

16. Letter from Carlsen to Leiper, Jan. 19, 1938, WCC files, New York.

17. *UELC Minutes, 1946*, pp. 14-16.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 179.

19. *Ibid.*, 1947, pp. 11-12.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 174, 182. Cp. *The Lutheran*, July 16, 1947, p. 6.

21. Letter from Carlsen to Leiper, July 16, 1947, WCC files, New York. Cp. *UELC Minutes, 1947*, p. 26.

22. *DELC Minutes, 1939*, pp. 16, 110-111.

23. Correspondence between Jensen and Leiper, 1941, WCC files, New York.

24. Letter from Leiper to Jensen, Oct. 23, 1944, WCC files, New York.

25. *ULCA Minutes, 1946*, pp. 219-222.

26. *DELC Minutes, 1946*, p. 4.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

28. Letter from Jensen to Visser 't Hooft, Nov. 22, 1947. Copy in WCC files, N.Y. Evidently the action of the June 1947 convention was not immediately communicated to WCC officials, for Eleanor Kent Brown wrote Jensen asking whether any action had been taken at the recent meeting. She stated that the American Committee for the WCC had already assigned places in the Amsterdam Assembly to the churches which were then members, adding that the Committee was most anxious that any church contemplating membership or having already taken action without their knowledge should receive its assignment of places for representation at Amsterdam. Letter from Eleanor Kent Browne to Jensen, July 16, 1947, WCC files, N.Y.

29. Letter from Leiper to Bersell, Oct. 19, 1945. Copy of letter in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

30. *The WCC, Its Process of Formation*, 1946, p. 17.

31. *Minutes and Reports of the Meeting of the Provisional Committee, Buck Hill Falls, Penn., April 1947*, pp. 9, 13-14, 43.

32. *AugS Minutes, 1947*, p. 25.

33. Members of the Sub-Committee on Resolutions were: Bishop George Bell, Dr. W. J. Gallagher, Bishop James C. Baker, Dr. Roswell P. Barnes, Dr. S. F. H. J. Berkelbach, Dr. T. C. Chao, Professor Georges Florovsky, Dr. John A. Mackay, Pastor Martin Niemoeller, Dr. Bella Vasady. *Minutes and Reports, Buck Hill Falls, April 1947*, pp. 13-14.

34. *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 90. Cp. *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches Held At Amsterdam, August 22nd to September 4th, 1948*, W. A. Visser 't Hooft, Editor, pp. 127-128, 136-137. See Appendix, pp. 330-331.

35. *Proceedings of the Lutheran World Federation Assembly, Lund, Sweden, June 30 - July 6, 1947*, The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa., 1948, p. 36.

36. *The Lutheran*, July 10, 1946, p. 4; Aug. 14, 1946, p. 6. *Proceedings, Lund, 1947*, pp. 15-16.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 24, 100.

38. *Ibid.*, pp. 135, 139.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

40. *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39. For Dr. Michelfelder's widely publicized article "What Do You Mean By 'Ecumenical'?" see Appendix, pp. 345-347.

CHAPTER X

1. Letter from Suomi Synod president, Rev. Raymond W. Wargelin, to Flesner, Sept. 17, 1955,

2. *World Missionary Conference, 1910*, *The History and Records of the Conference*, Edinburgh, 1910, p. 55.

3. *Stockholm, 1925, Official Report*, p. 22.

4. *Proceedings, Lausanne, 1927*, p. 511.

5. F&O Pamphlet No. 68, p. 9. In F&O Pamphlet No. 48, published June 16, 1927, prior to the Lausanne Conference, Burntvedt's name appears in the "Membership List of the Lausanne Conference" under the classification "By official appointment." In the Lausanne *Who's Who* and in Bate's official report he is simply listed as being present without stating in what capacity.

6. *1946 LFC Minutes*, p. 15. Cp. *Lutheran Messenger*, May 6, 1947, p. 3.

7. *1946 LFC Minutes*, pp. 18-19.

8. *Ibid*., p. 24. Cp. *Lutheran Messenger*, May 6, 1947, p. 3.

9. *Ibid*., pp. 3-4.

10. *Ibid*., May 20, 1947, pp. 4-5.

11. *1947 LFC Minutes*, p. 17.

12. *Ibid*., p. 30.

13. *Lutheran Messenger*, December 30, 1947, pp. 11-12; Jan. 13, 1948, pp. 5, 7. Wrote Knudsen, "Naturally a Lutheran will be tempted to take exception to the theological adequacy for unity in action of the WC basic formula for membership,--'acceptance of our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour.' In the effort to make the Council as broadly representative as possible such a minimal statement was considered necessary. On such a basis will come 85 members of Eastern Orthodoxy, valuing tradition over Scripture, to sit down together with repentant modernists turned Barthian, and others unrepentant still. It must

be questionable whether such a heterogeneous group can come to any concrete decision. Can a clear, unanimous word of God be spoken here? May an individual church not lose the voice it already has by joining? Whether Lutherans should join on this minimal basis appears to depend on their view of the nature of the Council. We could in no way concede that the Council is at this stage anything more than an open meeting of Christian churches to exchange information preliminary to a discussion of the bases of reunion with one another. Measured by the criterion of Article VII of the Augustana, the WC is ecclesiastical Babel; and such it must expect to remain for a long time to come."

Knudsen closed his presentation with a quotation from an article by Dr. Otto Piper which had appeared in the April, 1947, issue of *Theology Today*. "Our natural tendency to be generous and to give everybody freedom to express himself, coupled with the relative ease and comfort in which we live, have accentuated our view that theological propositions are interesting but irrelevant. Hidden behind this attitude is a widespread refusal to believe in an ultimate reality beyond homo religiousus. People believe in piety, faith or theology instead. The ensuing attempts to reach ecumenical understanding and union by ignoring denominational differences will necessarily lead to theological and ecclesiastical disintegration. We had better start reexamining our denominational standards and find out where we stand. The catastrophe that has befallen Europe has led theologians there to the recognition of the enormous responsibility that is incumbent upon Christian teachers. They are given the keys to God's Kingdom; yet if they be blind leaders they will carry others with them to hell. In such a position the theologian needs a divine commission which can be given only by the Church or the divine authority of the Bible. That is what theologians of the aforementioned emphases know and try to express. They will soon find out whether or not underlying the ecumenical movement there is a commonly recognized authority, apart from which all discussion will become meaningless." Portion of Piper's statement quoted by Knudsen. *Lutheran Messenger*, Jan. 13, 1948, p. 7.

14. *Ibid*., May 4, 1948, p. 4. Cp. *Proceedings*, *Lund*, *1947*, p. 91, for quotations from Report of Section III.

15. *Lutheran Messenger*, May 4, 1948, pp. 8-10.

16. Minnie Raaum, "The World Council of Churches," *Lutheran Messenger*, June 1, 1948, pp. 8-9.

17. *Ibid.*, May 18, 1948, pp. 6-7.

18, *1948 LFC Minutes*, p. 16.

19. For a complete picture of the 1948 Annual Conference action on the WCC see both the *1948 LFC Minutes*, pp. 124-125, and the *Lutheran Messenger*, June 29, 1948, p.3, and July 13, 1948, pp. 9-10.

Sverre Torgerson referred to the opposition to Council membership as having been prompted by "fear that by joining the Council the Lutheran Free Church would 'sell out,' spiritually and confessionally, or at least would give recognition to those who do not accept all the fundamentals of Christian confession." *Ibid.*, June 29, 1948, p. 3.

Pastor H. C. Caspersen in reporting "Some Impressions from the Conference" expressed the judgment that a "scarecrow" had been made of the modernist tendencies which doubtless do exist in some of the churches of the WCC. He reported that in the speeches against affiliation quotations from such men as Oxnam and others had been taken completely out of context, resulting in argumentation which sometimes bordered on the ludicrous, if not the absurd. *Ibid.*, July 13, 1948, p. 10.

20. Sigmond's name appears on p. 34 of the pre-Lausanne membership list published in F&O Pamphlet No. 48 and in the post-Lausanne F&O Pamphlet No. 68, p. 9, and in *Proceedings, Lausanne, 1927*, p. 522.

21. *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order*, p. 302. F&O Pamphlet No. 75, p. 16, published June 24, 1937, also lists the name of L. M. Stavig as being an official and fraternal visitor from the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America to the forthcoming Edinburgh Conference. Hodgson's official report, however, lists only Sigmon and Preus.

22. Letter from Aasgaard to Leiper, Jan. 19, 1939, WCC files, New York.

23. In his March 24, 1944 letter Leiper called attention to the Lutheran churches which had already accepted

membership in the WCC. He referred also to the Ecumenical Chaplaincy Commission of the WCC and its activity in behalf of prisoners of war. He noted the appointment by the Archbishop of Sweden of Pastor Carl Erik Wenngren to serve with the Chaplaincy Commission and also the names of other Lutherans on the WCC staff in Geneva, namely, Dr. A. Freudenberg who was in charge of the Commission for refugees; Dr. Hans Schoenfeld who was serving on the General Staff, and Dr. Ehrenstroem who was giving part time service to the WCC. Letter from Leiper to Aasgaard, March 24, 1944, WCC files, New York.

24. Letter from Aasgaard to Leiper, March 29, 1944, WCC files, New York.

25. Leiper to Aasgaard, April 3, 1944, WCC files, New York.

26. Leiper to Aasgaard, April 26, 1945; Aasgaard to Leiper, May 1, 1945, WCC files, New York.

27. *ULCA Minutes*, *1946*, p. 220.

28. *ELC Minutes*, *1946*, p. 17.

29. *Ibid*., p. 41.

30. *Ibid*., p. 395.

31. *Ibid*., p. 417. Cp. *Lutheran Herald*, July 2, 1946, p. 620.

32. *Ibid*., p. 620.

33. *Ibid*., Oct. 2, 1946, pp. 894-895. Four of the district presidents, Drs. Martin Anderson, R. M. Fjelstad, Nils Kleven and N. Astrup Larsen had been designated to speak for all nine district presidents following a recent meeting at which WCC membership had been discussed.

34. The editorials appeared in the following issues of the *Lutheran Herald*: May 27, 1947, June 10, 1947, June 17, 1947 and June 24, 1947. *Ibid*., June 17, 1947, pp. 515-516. For Minneapolis Theses see Appendix, p. 312.

35. *Ibid*., June 24, 1947, pp. 639-641.

36. *Ibid*., August 12, 1947, pp. 779-780.

37. *Ibid.*, Aug. 26, 1947, pp. 829-830, 832. Larsen, president of the ELC's Iowa District (later the South Central District), was a missionary to China from 1913 to 1927. For some years he served as a member of the China Continuation Committee which was formed under the guidance of John R. Mott following the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910. At the Paris meeting of the Lutheran World Convention in 1935 Larsen presented a paper on "Lutheranism and Foreign Missions in the Present World Situation" in which he stressed the importance of cooperation with other evangelical churches on the mission field. *Ibid.*, Aug. 26, 1947, p. 830; March 9, 1948, p. 231; April 27, 1948, p. 434; July 26, 1955, p. 690.

38. Julian G. Anderson, "A Matter of Conscience," *Ibid.*, Sept. 9, 1947, p. 875.

39. Norman B. Harstad, "Beware of False Prophets," *Ibid.*, Sept. 16, 1947, pp. 902-903.

40. Three articles in opposition to WCC membership by Myrwang appeared in the *Lutheran Herald*, "The World Council of Churches," Oct. 28, 1947, pp. 1047-1048; "The World Council, 'All this will I give thee, if,...,'" Nov. 25, 1947, pp. 1152-1153; "Shall We Join The Council?" Dec. 30, 1947, pp. 1280-1282.

In his second article Myrwang cited what he declared to be commonly given arguments in favor of joining the WCC: (1) Christ's prayer for unity. (2) A "World Church" would be able to speak decisively on social issues both on national and international levels thus helping to "Christianize the world order." (3) A world church of united Protestantism would be able to stand up against the pretension of the Vatican. (4) A world church would serve to stem the tide of communism. (5) A united Protestantism would help advance the world program of the church. (6) Accepting the simple doctrinal basis of the World Council would permit agreement between the churches.

To these purported arguments urging affiliation Myrwang gave the following answers: (1) The unity referred to in John 17 is a spiritual one, resting on the Word of God. Outward union without inner spiritual unity would carry within itself the seed of spiritual indifference, decay and disintegration. (2) The church has no authority, needs none, other than the Word of God. When she begins to trust in other authority she loses her inner life and life vitality. (3) Outward church organization is not the determining factor for survival in the battle between truth and error. Only the Word of God will count. (4) The church is not called on to fight or promote certain political or economic systems. (5) Christ's prayer for unity will never be fulfilled in any outward union built upon passive or active disregard of fundamental truths of the Christian faith. (6) Christian advance depends not on some super organization, but on the living witness of individuals and a reliance solely on the Word and Sacraments through which the Holy Spirit works. It is noted that the absolute unity of the Roman Church has not enabled that church to win the world for Christ or to Christianize the social order. Nor have the efforts of a united Federal Council of Churches in America brought any advance in that direction.

Seeking to explain the historic separation of Protestant forces at the time of the Reformation Myrwang maintains that the separation was not over the question whether or not the Bible was the inspired, inerrant Word of God, but whether or not human reason should sit in final judgment upon the Word of God. Luther and confessional Lutheranism gave second place to human reason while Zwingli and others gave first place to human reason.

The argument that membership in the Council should be accepted since other Lutheran Churches of America have already done so carried little weight with Mrywang. He countered that there are many pastors in these churches "whose hearts are filled with sorrow" over the fact that their churches had been drawn into the Council. He raised the question whether the decision to affiliate by these sister Lutheran bodies had really represented the will of the congregations and the general ministry of these synods, or whether it had not rather been a movement "pressed by certain prominent men."

That the Lutheran churches of the Scandinavian countries had joined the WCC he sought to explain by pointing to the fact that the churches there are state churches whose bishops and ministers are servants and officials of the state and out of touch with the pastors and congregations. "Church leaders come and go. Church leaders have made mistakes, often with tragic results. Church conventions have made mistakes. The Church of the Reformation must not be made to suffer defeat because of mistakes or unfaithfulness of leaders or of conventions." *Ibid.*, p. 1281.

41. *Ibid.*, Nov. 11, 1947, p. 1096.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 1096.

43. *Ibid.*, Dec. 23, 1947, pp. 1265-1266.

44. *Ibid.*, Nov. 18, 1947, pp. 1119-1120.

45. *Ibid.*, Dec. 30, 1947, pp. 1275-1276.

46. *Ibid.*, Dec. 30, 1947, p. 1276.

47. Publication of the booklet had been authorized by the Book Committee of the Church's Board of Publication in Dec. 1947. *Ibid.*, March 9, 1948, pp. 231-232. A disproportionate part of the booklet, 51 of its 65 pages, is devoted to arguments in opposition to affiliation. The reason for this was that Ofstedal's presentation had originally been prepared for publication in a separate pamphlet. Larsen's affirmative arguments were added at the last minute so that both sides of the question might receive a hearing. *Ibid.*, April 28, 1948, p. 431.

48. *Should We Join The World Council Of Churches?* pp. 5-6.

49. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-11.

50. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

51. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

52. *Ibid.*, pp. 14-18. In a footnote Dr. Larsen comments on the accusation that leaders in the World Council reject "verbal inspiration" of the Bible and the "blood atonement." Writes Larsen: "We need to recognize that many theologians who feel that they would stultify themselves by accepting a mechanical verbal inspiration, nevertheless with all their heart believe that the Bible not only contains but is the Word of God. Similarly, theologians who feel that certain formulations of the doctrine of the atonement are repulsive, with all their heart and soul believe that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.' (II Cor. 5:18), and would not for a moment hesitate to accept Luther's explanation of the

Second Article as a glorious summary of the doctrine of the atonement." Ibid., p. 16.

53. Ibid., pp. 16-17.

54. Ibid., pp. 36-37.

55. Ibid., pp. 41-44. The weak creedal statement of the WCC constitution is contrasted to the unequivocal doctrinal basis incorporated in the recently approved LWF constitution in which the Scriptures are openly and firmly acknowledged as "the only source and infallible norm of all church doctrines and practice" and adherence to the Lutheran Confessions reaffirmed. However, in common with other opponents of WCC membership, Ofstedal fails to give even the slightest acknowledgment to the LWF's endorsement of Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements.

56. Ibid., pp. 44-45.

57. Ibid., p. 45.

58. Ibid., p. 48.

59. Ibid., pp. 49-50. Cp. H. Paul Douglass, "Ecumenicity Across the Street," Christendom, Summer, 1947, pp. 498-514.

60. Should We Join The World Council Of Churches, pp. 50-51.

61. Ibid., pp. 53-54.

62. Matthew 7:15-16.

63. Matthew 16:11b.

64. II Timothy 2:17.

65. Romans 16:16.

66. II Thessalonians 3:14-15.

67. II John 9-11.

68. Among the many letters that appeared in the Lutheran Herald following the publication of Should We Join The World Council of Churches? of special interest are those by the authors of the booklet, N. Astrup Larsen and R. A.

Ofstedal. Ofstedal's letter which was mainly an answer to criticism of his presentation by Malmin, appeared in the April 13, 20 and 27 issues. Larsen's letter, which is mainly an evaluation and criticism of Ofstedal's presentation, appeared on April 20 and 27.

69. Lutheran Herald, March 9, 1948, pp. 231-232.

70. Ibid., April 27, 1948, p. 430.

71. Galatians 1:8.

72. Lutheran Herald, April 27, 1948, pp. 430-431.

73. Ibid., April 20, 1948, pp. 405-406.

74. Ibid., April 27, 1948, pp. 431-435. Reasons cited by Dr. Anderson in favor of affiliation with the WCC: (1) The World Council would bring closer together the outwardly divided Christian Church for the greatest possible united impact upon a world desperately in need of Jesus Christ. The times demanded a united testimony. (2) Because of the contribution which Lutheranism, with its basic doctrines of the Word Alone, Grace Alone, and Faith Alone, could make. (3) Membership in the WCC would help Lutherans guard against smugness and pride which fails to realize that God has given much to others too. Lutherans do not have a monopoly of divine grace. (4) Christian unity is essential to an effective promulgation of the Gospel in non-Christian lands. The divided state of Christendom is a great hindrance as the Church seeks to spread the Gospel. Dr. Anderson noted that Larsen, one of the chief spokesmen urging ELC membership in the WCC spoke out of knowledge gained through many years in China and out of convictions forged in the white heat of conflict with paganism as it confronted the foreign missionary. (5) To help Protestant minorities which were being oppressed in Roman Catholic dominated lands. It was important that Protestantism be able to speak with one voice when occasion required, even as Rome does. (6) The ELC was already involved with the WCC in relief work in Europe. "Is not this a bit embarrassing if we cannot accept membership in the Council?" The following statement by Dr. Michelfelder was quoted: "If it had not been for the World Council and its Department of Reconstruction our Lutheran World Action could not have functioned as efficiently or with as few complications." Ibid., p. 434.

Objections against affiliation cited and answered by Dr. Anderson: (1) Objection: There are liberals in some of the church bodies within the Council, even among the leadership. Answer: Unfortunately it is so and is to be deplored. However, membership in the Council puts a stamp of approval only on the official doctrinal statement in the Council's constitution and on its logical implications--not upon unscriptural views that may be present in the confessions of member churches. We take the Council's doctrinal basis at face value. If some have reservations as to this confessional statement or repudiate its real meaning, the responsibility is on them, not on us. (2) Objection: Different interpretations can be given as to how Christ saves. Answer: For this very reason our Lutheran testimony is needed. "Let us not stand on the sidelines and criticize. Let us get in and let our light shine and make our testimony where it can do the most good." (3) Objection: Membership in the Council will confuse our laity, encouraging them to conclude that differences in doctrine are not important. Answer: "I refuse to believe that Lutheranism is such a fragile thing that it will suffer harm in testimony, in study, and work." A statement by Michelfelder is quoted in which he declared that he considered himself ot be a better Lutheran because of his close contact with non-Lutherans, for such contacts help one to appreciate even more one's Lutheran heritage. "If we can't stand up against liberals there is something wrong with us." (5) Objection: The World Council is closely related to and of the same spirit as the modernist controlled Federal Council and a projection on a world scale of the Federal Council. Answer: The two are completely separate organizations. They have different doctrinal bases. The World Council is a fellowship of churches, not a federation of churches. (6) Objection: The World Council aspires to be a super-church. Answer: This contention has been pointedly denied in a statement adopted by the Provisional Committee on April 25, 1947: "... While earnestly seeking the co-operation and unity of all the churches that accept its basis, the Council disavows any thought of becoming a single unified church structure dominated by a centralized administrative authority." Lutheran Herald, April 27, 1948, pp. 434-435.

75. Ibid., May 11, 1948, p. 493.

76. Ibid., p. 493.

77. Ibid., April 27, 1948, p. 420.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 419.

79. *ELC Minutes, 1948*, p. 20. Cp. *Lutheran Herald*, May 25, 1948, p. 527.

80. *ELC Minutes, 1948*, pp. 31-32. Cp. *Lutheran Herald*, April 27, 1948, p. 429.

81. *ELC Minutes, 1948*, p. 492. Cp. *Lutheran Herald*, June 22, 1948, p. 626.

CHAPTER XI

1. *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, The Official Report*, Edited by Dr. Visser 't Hooft, pp. 245-247. Alternates: AugS, Professor Theodor Le Vander and Dr. E. E. Ryden; ULCA, Dr. Paul C. Empie, Dr. Stewart Herman, Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, and Miss A. Barbara Wiegand. *Ibid.*, pp. 254-255. Two Lutheran leaders from America were consultants to the Assembly: Dr. S. C. Michelfelder, executive secretary of the LWF who also attended in the capacity of a fraternal visitor, and Dr. Nolde. Pastor Wilton E. Bergstrand, youth director of the AugS attended as a member of the Youth Department of the WCC. Three Lutherans from America served as staff members of the WCC. Dr. Frederick E. Reissig of the ULCA served as public relations officer for the Assembly. Mr. Willmar L. Thorkelson, ELC, served as reporter for the Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid. Miss Antonia H. Froendt attended as a staff worker of the New York office of the American Committee. Among the press representatives were Dr. Otto H. Bostrom, who served as correspondent for *The Lutheran*, and Dr. Delmar L. Dreyson, editor of *The Link* and *The Chaplain*, issued by the Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains. *Lutheran Standard*, August 21, 1948, p. 5.

2. *First Assembly*, 223, 245, 246, 247, 226, 156-159. *ULCA Minutes, 1948*, p. 261.

3. *First Assembly*, pp. 218-219. *Minutes of the Meeting of the Central Committee*, September 4th to 6th, 1948, at Woudschoten, The Netherlands, p. 4. *ULCA Minutes, 1948*, p. 261.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 261. *First Assembly*, p. 225. *Man's Disorder*

And God's Design, *The Amsterdam Series*, Vol. IV, pp. 143-189. The Central Committee at its meeting immediately following the Amsterdam Assembly appointed the five associate general secretaries. *Minutes* of the Central Committee, September 4th to 6th, 1948, pp. 26-27.

5. *First Assembly*, p. 226. *ULCA Minutes, 1948*, p. 261.

6. Delegates of the Lutheran churches in America participated in the following Sections: Fry, Wentz, Nyholm, Section I; Yochum, Bersell, Stoughton, Section II; Jensen, Mrs. Almond, Section III; Ewald and Nilson, Section IV. *First Assembly*, pp. 245-247.

7. An official statement was made from the chair that "received" was not to be considered the equivalent of either "adopted" or "accepted." *Ibid.*, p. 87. *ULCA Minutes, 1948*, p. 261. At the Lausanne Conference in 1927 the ULCA delegation suggested that reports be "received" rather than "adopted."

8. *Christianity and Crisis*, Vol. VIII, No. 7, April 26, 1948, p. 49.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 50.

10. *ULCA Minutes, 1948*, p. 264. *Lutheran Standard*, May 17, 1947, p. 4; May 24, 1947, p. 4; May 8, 1948, p. 4.

11. Letter from Alfred Jensen to Visser 't Hooft, Nov. 22, 1947, Copy in WCC files, New York. Letter from N. C. Carlsen to Leiper, July 16, 1947. WCC files, New York. *AugS Minutes, 1947*, p. 25. Wentz as early as Sept. 6, 1946 reported to Fry that Visser 't Hooft was highly pleased with the amendment as drawn up at Horsham. Copy of letter from Wentz to Fry in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

11. *Lutheran Standard*, May 8, 1948, p. 4.

12. *Documents of the World Council of Churches*, Amsterdam, 1948, p. 21. See Appendix, pp. 331-332.

13. *First Assembly*, pp. 112-113.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 121. See Appendix, pp. 320-322.

15. *ULCA Minutes, 1948*, pp. 264-265. *First Assembly*, pp. 124-125, 133-135.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 134.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 124-125, 135. *ULCA Minutes, 1948*, pp. 264-265.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 265.

19. *First Assembly*, p. 145.

20. *Minutes of the Meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, September 4th to 6th, 1948, at Woudschoten, The Netherlands*, pp. 30-31.
The Charter of the Youth Department as revised at Woudschoten provides that "The primary task of the Youth Department is to help the churches and through them their youth organisations in giving to their youth a sense of participation in and responsibility to the Church." "The Youth Department shall sustain close working relationships with the member churches of the World Council and through them with their youth departments. It will also work with national ecumenical youth agencies. Since the World Council is a World Council of Churches, the youth movements of the churches are organically related to the Council through their respective churches. The Youth Department of the Council, therefore, does not ask youth movements to affiliate themselves directly with the Youth Department." *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.

The statement, "The Policy of the Youth Department," provides that "Since the World Council is a World Council of Churches, the younger members of these churches are organically related to the Council through their respective churches. The Youth Department will constantly seek to develop among younger church members the sense of belonging to the ceumenical movement and of participation in the work of the World Council, but the Department as such has no membership. The Department will also cooperate with interdenominational youth organisations which desire to relate themselves to the ecumenical work of the World Council." *Ibid.*, p. 41.

The Constitution of the Youth Department provides that "In order that the structure of the Youth Department Committee may correspond as nearly as possible to the structure of the World Council as a whole, in the whole process of selecting and electing the members of the Committee due regard shall be given to those factors which govern the allocation of places in the Assembly of the World Council, namely, numerical size, adequate con-

confessional representation and adequate geographical distribution." "The member churches of the World Council, either singly or at their option in confessional or regional groups will submit nominations for the membership of the Youth Department Committee. Nominations may include Youth executive as well as young people taking a leading part in Christian youth activities." *Ibid.*, p. 42.

21. *ULCA Minutes, 1948*, p. 267.

CHAPTER XII

1. Rouse and Neill, *op. cit.*, p. 340.

2. Quoted by Frank M. North in *Twenty Years of Federation, Report of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1924-1928*, Edited by Samuel McCrea Cavert, New York, 1929, p. 19.

3. Rouse and Neill, *op. cit.*, pp. 257, 621.

4. *Report of Committee on Plan and Scope, Adopted April 20, 1911.* F&O Pamphlet 1.

5. Letter from Leiper to Fry, Jan. 16, 1945. Copy in WCC files, N.Y.

6. *ULCA Minutes, 1922*, pp. 92-93.

7. *The Christian Century*, March 7, 1956, p. 305.

APPENDIX I

OFFICIAL STATEMENTS AND DECLARATIONS

Declaration of Principles Concerning the Church and Its External Relationships Adopted by The United Lutheran Church in America, October 26, 1920, Washington, D. C., commonly known as "The Washington Declaration".

Whereas, During the past two years the Executive Board has been asked repeatedly to define the attitude of The United Lutheran Church in America toward co-operative movements, both within and without the Lutheran Church, toward movements of various kinds looking in the direction of church union, and toward organizations, tendencies and movements, some of them within and some of them without the organized Church: and

Whereas, The Constitution of The United Lutheran Church in America (Art. VIII, Sec. 1) and its By-Laws (Sec. 5, Div. C. Items 1 and 2) require that the forming and dissolving of "relations with other bodies, organizations and movements" lies within the power of The United Lutheran Church alone and that "all questions affecting the principles, practice and policy of the Church as a whole" shall be referred to the Church for decision: therefore,

The Executive Board submits to The United Lutheran Church the following DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND ITS EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS, and recommends it for adoption.

In order that all misunderstandings and misconstructions of this Declaration, or of any of its parts, may be avoided, The United Lutheran Church in America declares in advance that it does not regard the statements therein contained as altering or amending the Confessions of the Church in any particular, or as changing the doctrinal basis of The United Lutheran Church, set forth in Article II of the Constitution. On the contrary, it considers this Declaration nothing more than the application to present conditions of doctrines already contained in the Confessions.

A. Concerning the Catholic Spirit in the Church

I. In its Confessions the Evangelical Lutheran Church declares its belief that there is "one holy Church," which "will continue forever". It defines this Church as the "congregation of saints and true believers. (Augs. Conf., VII and VIII.)

II. This one holy Church performs its earthly functions and makes its presence known among men through groups of men who profess to be believers in Jesus Christ. In these groups the Word of God is preached and the Sacraments are administered. To such groups also the name "Church" is given in the New Testament and in the Confessions of our Church.

III. The existence of the one, holy Church is not capable of demonstration. It is a "mystery" that can be apprehended only by faith. To the eyes of men it appears that there is not one Church, but only many churches; nevertheless we believe that there is but one Church of Jesus Christ. This conviction rests upon our belief in the continued life of Christ in all His Christians, binding them together into one spiritual body, of which He is the Head, and building them up into one spiritual Temple, of which He is the Cornerstone; and upon our belief in the efficacy of the Word of God and the Sacraments as Means of Grace (A.C., V). We believe that wherever the Word of God is preached and the Sacraments are administered, the Holy Spirit works faith in Christ. In every such place, therefore, there are believers in Jesus Christ, and wherever there are believers, there the one holy Church is present. For this reason we call the Word and the Sacraments "marks" or "signs" of the one holy Church. Therefore the Augsburg Confession adds to its definition of the Church the words, "in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered."

IV. In the Nicene Creed we confess our belief that this Church is "one, holy, catholic and apostolic."

1. We believe that this Church is one, because we believe that there cannot be more than one "congregation of saints and true believers", or more than one spiritual Temple of which He is the Cornerstone.

2. We believe that this Church is holy, because we believe that to all believers the righteousness of Christ is given, with the forgiveness of their sins, for which reason true believers are called "saints" in the New Testament and in the Confessions of our Church. Moreover, the Holy Spirit, through the Word and the Sacraments preached and administered in the churches, does progressively create holiness of life and will and purpose in all those who believe, and progress-

ively unites their lives with the continued life of Christ.

3. We believe that this one holy Church is catholic, because we believe that, since there is but one "congregation of saints and true believers," it must include all the saints and true believers, of every time and place (Apol., Chap. IV). By the term "catholic," therefore, we describe that quality of universality which belongs to the Church as a spiritual reality, or object of faith (Cf. III, above), and raises it above all local and temporal forms of expression in organization, rite and ceremony.

4. We believe that this one, holy, catholic Church is also apostolic, not because of the union of its members in any one organization which claims to possess external, historical connection with the apostles, but because we believe that the faith in Jesus Christ, which all the members of the one, holy catholic Church have in common, is the same faith that was in the hearts and lives of the apostles of Jesus Christ; and because we believe that this faith has been and still is perpetuated by the unbroken testimony of believers, through all the centuries of Christian history, from the days of the apostles to the present day; and because we believe that in the Holy Scriptures we have a permanent and authoritative record of that apostolic truth which is the ground of Christian faith.

V. Every group of professing Christians calling itself a Church will seek to express in its own life the attributes of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. This it does:

1. By professing faith in Jesus Christ. Faith in Christ, as the Saviour of the world and the Revealer of the will and love of God the Father, is necessary to the existence of the Church. Therefore, no group of men, however organized, which does not exist as a congregation of professed believers in Jesus Christ, may claim the name of Church; for it is Christ Himself, living, by the Holy Spirit, in believing Christians, Who makes the Church one and holy.

2. By preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments. Every group calling itself a Church must preach the Word and administer the Sacraments, for these are the means through which the Holy Spirit works faith, and thus creates and perpetuates the one holy Church. Therefore, the Word and the Sacraments are properly called "marks" of the Church (Cf. III, above), for where they are present the Church is;

where they are absent the Church is not and cannot be.

In the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments every group of Christians seeks to express the apostolic character of the one holy Church. Every such group bases its preaching and teaching upon the Scriptures, and endeavors to proclaim what it has learned from them. Believing that it has correctly ascertained this truth, it becomes its duty to teach, preach and confess it fully, freely and courageously. Christians must not only profess their faith in Christ, but must also confess and publicly declare what they believe about Christ and His Gospel; this duty of every Christian is the imperative duty of every group of Christians calling itself a Church.

3. By works of serving love. The ideals of love and service which Christ has taught as the true ideals of the individual Christian life, must also be the ideals of any group calling itself a Church. The love of Christians for God and His Christ, for one another and their fellow men, is a motive strong enough to drive them to works of service, and this love, itself a creation of God the Holy Spirit within the hearts of men, sets tasks for every group that calls itself a Church. They are tasks of service, not of government; of love, not of law (Cf. D, IV, 3, below). These works of love and service are a witness to the faith that lives in the whole group and an evidence of the presence of the living Christ, and are in themselves a proclamation of the Gospel. In outward form they may appear to be merely humanitarian and altruistic; in motive they are Christian, born of the love of Christ, and performed in His name and in obedience to His command.

4. By the attempt to secure universal acceptance of the truth which it holds and confesses. Such an attempt need not be accompanied by the effort to enlarge its own external organization by drawing into its membership Christians of other organizations, for the aim of a Church should be not to make proselytes, but to spread the truth of the Gospel. To this end it will constantly bear witness to the truth which it believes, and by this testimony, and by the cultivation of sympathy with all those who hold the same truth, every group will seek to attain universality, and thus express completely the holy Church's attribute of catholicity.

5. To accomplish these purposes (Nos. 1-4 above) every such group will maintain the office of the ministry, commanded and instituted by Christ. For the sake of good order and

efficiency, further organization is also necessary, but the forms which the organization takes will vary with circumstances of time and place, and are, in themselves, matters of expediency.

VI. Every group of professing Christians in which the Word of God is so preached and the Sacraments are so administered that men are saved therein is truly, partial and imperfect, as it may be, an expression of the one holy Church (Cf. II, above), inasmuch as it displays the marks of the Church (Cf. III and V, 2, above). Therefore, no one group can rightfully claim that it is the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church in the sense in which these terms have been defined above (No. IV).

We believe, however, that distinctions must be recognized between one group and another. In making these distinctions, we believe that those groups in which the Word of God is most purely preached and confessed, according to the Holy Scriptures, and in which the Sacraments are administered in the closest conformity to the institution of Christ, will be the most complete expression of the one, holy Church. For this reason it is necessary that, when occasion arises, any such group of Christians shall define its relationship to other groups which also claim the name of Church, as well as to other groups and organizations which do not bear that name.

VII. This definition of relationships should be framed in the spirit of catholicity. Moved by that spirit, a Church will always be ready:

1. To declare unequivocally what it believes concerning Christ and His Gospel, and to endeavor to show that it has placed the true interpretation upon that Gospel (Cf. V, 2 and 4, above), and to testify definitely and frankly against error.

2. To approach others without hostility, jealousy, suspicion or pride, in the sincere and humble desire to give and receive Christian service.

3. To grant cordial recognition to all agreements which are discovered between its own interpretation of the Gospel and that which others hold.

4. To co-operate with other Christians in works of serving love (Cf. V, 3, above) in so far as this can be done without surrender of its interpretation of the Gospel, without denial of conviction, and without suppression of its testimony as to what it holds to be the truth.

B. Concerning the Relation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church Bodies to One Another

In the case of those Church Bodies calling themselves Evangelical Lutheran, and subscribing the Confessions which have always been regarded as the standards of Evangelical Lutheran doctrine, The United Lutheran Church in America recognizes no doctrinal reasons against complete co-operation and organic union with such bodies.

C. Concerning the Organic Union of Protestant Churches

In view of the widespread discussion concerning the organic union of the Protestant Churches in America, we declare:

1. That we hold the union of Christians in a single organization to be of less importance than the agreement of Christians in the proclamation of the Gospel. We believe that the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church exists through and under divergent forms of external organization. Union of organization we hold, therefore, to be a matter of expediency; agreement in testimony to be a matter of principle.

II. That holding the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments to be the primary function of every Church, we believe that a clear definition of what is meant by "Gospel" and "Sacrament" must precede any organic union of the Churches. We believe that a permanent and valid union of Churches must be based upon positive agreements concerning the truth for which the united Church Body is to stand. The Churches cannot unite as mere protestants, but only as confessors. (Cf. A, V, 2; VII, 4.)

III. That as a necessary step toward a genuine organic union, we believe that the Protestant Church Bodies in America should endeavor to set forth, definitely and positively, the views of Christian truth for which each of them does now actually stand, in order that by their clear and unequivocal testimony to what they hold to be the truth, the nature and extent of their agreements and disagreements may become apparent.

IV. That we recognize the obligation which rests upon us to make a clear and full declaration concerning the truth which we hold, and are therefore ready, as opportunity offers, to give answer concerning our reasons for accepting and maintaining the doctrines and principles set forth in the 6onfessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

V. That until a more complete unity of confession is attained than now exists, The United Lutheran Church in America is bound in duty and in conscience to maintain its separate identity as a witness to the truth which it knows; and its members, its ministers, its pulpits, its fonts and its altars must testify only to that truth.

D. Concerning Co-operative Movements Among the Protestant Churches

In view of the many proposals for co-operation of the Protestant Churches in various departments of practical activity, and in view of the many organizations already formed, and in process of formation, for the carrying on of such co-operative work, we declare

I. That it is our earnest desire to co-operate with other Church Bodies in all such works as can be regarded as works of serving love, through which the faith of Christians finds expression; provided, that such co-operation does not involve the surrender of our interpretation of the Gospel, the denial of conviction, or the suppression of our testimony to what we hold to be the truth. (Cf. A, V, 4; VII, 3 above.) In this connection, however, we call attention to the Constitution of The United Lutheran Church in America, Article VIII, Section 1, "No Synod, Conference or Board, or any official representative thereof, shall have the power of independent affiliation with general organizations and movements," and also to the By-Laws, Article V, Division C, Item 2, "No official relationship with any other ecclesiastical bodies or their agencies shall be entered into by any Board or Committee of The United Lutheran Church in America, without the approval of the Church."

II. That we cannot give general approval to all co-operative movements and organizations of the Churches, since we hold that co-operation is not an end in itself, but merely a means to an end. Our attitude toward any such organization or movement must be determined by a consideration of

(a) The purposes which it seeks to accomplish.

(b) The principles on which it rests.

(c) The effect which our participation will produce upon the independent position of our Church as a witness to the truth of the Gospel which we confess. (Cf. C, VII, above.)

III. That, holding the following doctrines and principles, derived from the Holy Scriptures, to be fundamental to the Christian message, we propose them as a positive basis of practical co-operation among the Protestant Churches. To avoid all possible misunderstandings or misconstructions of these statements, we declare that we do not regard them as a summary of Lutheran doctrine, or as an addition to, a substitute for, or a modification of the Confessions of our Church; nor do we propose them as an adequate basis for an organic union of the Churches, but merely as a criterion by which it may be possible for us to determine our attitude toward proposed movements of co-operation.

1. The Fatherhood of God, revealed in His Son Jesus Christ, and the sonship bestowed by God, through Christ, upon all who believe in Him.

2. The true Godhead of Jesus Christ, and His redemption of the world by His life and death and resurrection; and His living presence in His Church.

3. The continued activity of God the Holy Spirit among men, calling them into the fellowship of Jesus Christ, and enlightening and sanctifying them through the gifts of His grace.

4. The supreme importance of the Word of God and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as the means through which the Holy Spirit testifies of Christ and thus creates and strengthens faith. (In common with the whole Evangelical Lutheran Church, we confess the mystery of the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and we invite all Christians to a renewed study of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures concerning this Sacrament, and the Sacrament of Holy Baptism.)

5. The authority of the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only rule and standard by which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged.

6. The reality and universality of sin, and the inability of men, because of sin, to attain righteousness or earn salvation through their own character or works.

7. The love, and the righteousness, of God, Who for Christ's sake bestows forgiveness and righteousness upon all who believe in Christ.

8. The present existence upon earth of the kingdom of God, founded by His Son Jesus Christ, not as an external organization, but as a spiritual reality and an object of faith.

9. The hope of Christ's second coming, to be the Judge of the living and the dead, and to complete the kingdom of God.

IV. That, in view of the above statements, our attitude toward proposed co-operative movements and organizations, already defined in principle in Section A, VII and D,I, above, must be subject to the following limitations:

1. We cannot enter into any co-operative movement or organization which denies any of the doctrines or principles set forth in III, above.

2. We cannot enter into any organization or movement which limits the co-operating Churches in their confession of the truth or their testimony against error. In all co-operative movements we claim the right, and regard it as a duty, to testify freely to the truth as it is set forth in the Confessions of our Church, and we believe that the same right must be guaranteed to every participating Church. All such testimony should receive a courteous and respectful hearing.

3. We cannot enter into co-operative movements or organizations whose purposes lie outside the proper sphere of Church activity. In determining what that sphere is, we must be guided by the fundamental principle that the functions of the Church are the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the performance of works of love (Cf. A, V, above). We hold that the use of the Church organization as an agency for securing the enactment and enforcement of law, or for the application of other methods of external force, is foreign to the true purpose for which the Church exists.

V. That there are organizations and movements into which we cannot enter as a Church, in regard to which, however, the Church may definitely declare itself and which it may heartily commend to the pastors and members of its congregations as important spheres of activity for Christians, such as movements and organizations for social and political reform, the enforcement of law and order, the settlement of industrial conflicts, the improvement of the material environments of life, and the like.

E. Concerning Movements and Organizations Injurious To the Christian Faith

In view of the prevalence throughout our land of doctrines which are subversive of the Christian faith; and in view of the indifference manifested by many Christian people to the doctrines and principles of the teachers, sects and organizations which seek their adherence and support; and in view of the fact that through the acceptance of religious and other teachings which contradict the Gospel of Christ, the faith of Christians is endangered; we declare

I. That we solemnly warn all our pastors and the members of our congregations against all teachers, sects and organizations of any kind, whose doctrines and principles contradict the truths set forth in Section D, III, of this Declaration, or which limit their adherents or members in a free confession of their Christian faith (Cf. A, V, 3, above.)

II. That we warn them especially against all teachers, sects and societies whose doctrines and principles deny the reality of sin, the personality of God, the full and complete Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, and His redemption of the world by His sufferings and death, and the truth and authority of the Holy Scriptures; as well as against all teachers, sects and societies which teach that men can be saved from sin, or can become righteous before God, by their own works or by any other means than the grace and mercy of God in Jesus Christ. We believe that such doctrines are not only not Christian, but are anti-Christian and destructive of true Christian faith and life.

III. That inasmuch as these and other false and dangerous doctrines are widely spread, not only by the activity of individual teachers, but also by the dissemination of literature and through the agency of societies and other organizations, calling themselves by various names which oftentimes conceal the real nature of the doctrines and principles for which they stand; we therefore lay it upon the consciences of the pastors and of the members of all our congregations to scrutinize with the utmost care the doctrines and principles of all teachers sects, organizations and societies of every sort which seek their adherence and support, and to refuse such adherence and support in all cases of conflict or possible contradiction between these principles and doctrines and those set forth in Holy Scripture and in the Confessions of the Church. In the application of this principle the Church should always appeal to a conscience which it is her sacred duty to enlighten, patiently and persistently, from the Word of God. (Cf., also Constitution of The United Lutheran Church in America, Art. VIII, Sec. 6.)

--ULCA Minutes, 1920, pp. 92-101.

LUTHERANS AND ECUMENICAL MOVEMENTS

The Present Trend to Ecumenicity

1. Ours is a day of enlarging relationships. The recent advances of the physical sciences and changed conditions in the economic, the educational, and the political realms have brought about a number of ecumenical movements. Organizations and fellowships hitherto largely limited in scope are galvanizing themselves into world-wide proportions.

2. Religious Bodies that have always laid claim to ecumenical character are pressing those claims today with new vigor. Prominent among these are Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism. New organizations are coming into being and aggressively striving for ecumenical expression. In many quarters it is held that wholesale disaster to the Christian Church can only be averted by closer integration of the Christian forces of the world. So there have come to be a number of cooperative organizations seeking the participation of Christians and Church Bodies across national boundaries. Such are the World's Conference on Faith and Order, the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, the International Missionary Council, and the World Student Christian Federation.

3. With reference to participation in these ecumenical movements and others of more local scope our people are perplexed. With reference to their relations with other Christian Churches making ecumenical claims our Lutheran Churches are waiting for light and leading. The Lutheran World Convention has several times discussed these and related questions and has occasionally made pronouncements on certain aspects of the problems involved. Today the ripeness of the times and the urgency of the situation seem to call for a comprehensive statement that may serve to guide the Churches adhering to the Convention. The Executive Committee therefore presents the following message and recommendations.

A. The Ecumenical Character of Lutheranism

Amid the many claims upon Lutheran Churches to participate in general ecumenical movements or to relate themselves to special Christian groups, it may be useful to point out the ecumenical character of Lutheranism itself. Even apart from the large number and the geographical distribution of its adherents the very genius of Lutheranism is essentially ecuemnical. It has always been so.

The heart of Lutheranism comes from the heart of the Bible and has its home in the heart of human personality. Based upon prophetic and apostolic Scriptures and growing out of the elemental human experience of personal faith, the Lutheran interpretation of the Gospel is not bound to incidentals, such as polity or liturgy or type of piety. With the God-Man as its center and the universal priesthood of believers as its radius it covers the whole range of the human family and can never be the exclusive possession of any particular race, nation or temperament. Because Lutherans hold that the only marks of the true Church are the Word and the Sacraments, they believe that there has been a true Christian Church through all time and that 'one holy Church will continue forever' (Augsburg Confession, Art. VII.). Because they lay no emphasis upon such local and temporal forms as organization, human traditions, rites and ceremonies, but teach that in 'the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of Sacraments' (A. C. VII), they are ready to recognize true Christians under whatever name or organization they may be found. The universal appeal of the Lutheran interpretation of the Gospel, the elemental quality of the Lutheran understanding of faith, and the catholic breadth of the Lutheran doctrine of the Church, impart to Lutheranism an ecumenical quality that must be remembered in these days of emphasis upon externals. In the truest sense Lutheranism is itself an ecumenical movement.

B. The Need for Lutheran Solidarity

1. This fundamentally ecumenical character of Lutheranism should receive more concrete expression than has yet been done. This concrete expression is not a matter of principle but only of expediency in view of the present religious situation in the world. The times seem to demand that the inner unity already existing among the Lutherans of the world be cultivated and mobilized in Lutheran world solidarity.

2. The purpose of this outward expression of Lutheran fellowship is not ostentation, not the display of size or so-called achievements. Nor is it a political purpose, because Lutherans expressly renounce all secular motives and repudiate all intention of invading the proper sphere of the State. It is not in obeisance to an idealistic inter-nationalism. Nor is it to form a super-Church, for that might hamper the individual Churches in their work. The purpose in seeking to develop Lutheran solidarity is to help meet the difficulties that confront our Churches just now in common with all

Christendom, to unite our forces in support of our Lutheran brethren who even now are suffering for their faith, and to secure co-operation of Lutherans everywhere in entering the new doors and traversing the new paths that God has recently opened to the progress of the evangelical spirit. The purpose is to help one another in preserving and sharing with all nations the treasures we possess in the Gospel of our Lord whom we know to be the Redeemer of the world from sin.

3. This purpose is to be achieved:

(a) by prosecuting vigorously all the objectives of the Lutheran World Convention as expressed in the resolutions adopted by its general gatherings,

(b) by cultivating a Lutheran consciousness in individual Lutherans and in Lutheran Church Bodies,

(c) by furthering Lutheran unity within the several lands where Lutheran forces are not at present united,

(d) by forming a practical entente or alliance among all of the Lutheran Church Bodies in the world, and

(e) by harmonious voice and united action with reference to present-day ecumenical movements and general co-operative organization among Christians, approving what appears to Lutherans to be evangelical in those movements and organizations and repudiating what appears to us to be un-evangelical.

4. In thus expressing the world solidarity of Lutheranism it will be constantly incumbent upon the Lutheran Churches of the world to bear unequivocal witness to the truth of the Gospel as they understand it. This will involve several relationships of these Churches:

(a) their relation to their common Lutheran heritage in the Word of God,

(b) their relation to one another as Lutheran Churches, and

(c) their relation to Christian Churches claiming ecumenical character in themselves and to other Churches in those movements and organizations that aim at the solution of present-day problems of larger scope.

C. Recommendations

The Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention therefore makes the following recommendations:

I. Concerning Evangelical Consciousness

1. That the Lutheran World Convention take all possible measures to deepen the evangelical consciousness of the Lutheran Churches of the world, to intensify their devotion to the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to stimulate their fidelity to his revealed Word.

2. That the Lutheran World Convention urge each of the Lutheran Churches of the world to take warning from the present religious situation and to multiply its efforts to cultivate the Lutheran consciousness of its members and their faithfulness to the Gospel of our Lord.

3. That the Lutheran World Convention warn the Lutheran Churches of the world against the growing range of such pernicious influences as atheism, secularism, syncretism, sectarianism, and politico-ecclesiasticism.

II. Concerning Lutheran World Solidarity

1. That the Lutheran World Convention take all possible measures to cultivate among the Lutheran Churches of the world a sense of common interest and to fashion among them the implements necessary for Lutheran solidarity.

2. That the Lutheran World Convention urge each of the Lutheran Churches of the world to cultivate in its members a sense of common interest above all with the Lutherans of the whole world.

3. That the Lutheran World Convention with its volume of service to World Lutheranism presents itself as the agent for such world-wide co-operation among Lutherans as the Churches of the several lands may desire to employ in these efforts to cultivate their evangelical consciousness and their sense of Lutheran solidarity.

4. That the Lutheran World Convention urge the Lutheran Churches of the world in their relations with other Churches and general ecumenical movements or organizations carefully to maintain existing unities among those who hold the Lutheran interpretation of the Christian faith and not to jeopardize the solidarity of ecumenical Lutheranism.

III. Concerning Ecclesiastical Relationships

1. That recognizing that there are true Christians in every Church of whatever name, the Lutheran Churches of the world should approach the question of their relationship with general movements in the spirit of catholicity and without hostility or prejudice. While they should make no effort to gloss genuine difference they should nevertheless proceed in the sincere and humble desire to render service and co-operate in works of Christian love.

2. That the Lutheran Churches of the world should proceed with united front in their relations with ecumenical Christian movements, general co-operative organizations, or Christian Churches claiming universality. They should agree among themselves as to their united participation or non-participation.

3. That participation of Lutheran Churches in co-operative movements or general organizations among the Protestant Churches of the world, can be effected only when the following principles are observed:

(a) The co-operative movement or general organization guarantees to every participating Church the right to declare unequivocally what it believes concerning Christ and His Gospel and to testify definitely and frankly against error, and the co-operative movement or general organization guarantees that such testimony will receive courteous and respectful hearing.

(b) The co-operative movement or general organization specifically declares that the participating Churches are not bound by the actions of the entire group nor responsible for the opinions of the entire group but only such actions and opinions as the individual Church Bodies themselves may enact or adopt.

(c) The co-operative movement or general organization in all of its assemblies, conferences, and parts, is constituted of official representatives of Church Bodies.

(d) The co-operative movement or general organization cherishes only such purposes as lie within the proper sphere of Church activity. It recognizes that the proper functions of the Church are the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the performance of the works of Christian love. The true function of the Church does not include the use of the Church organization as an agency for securing the enactment or enforcement of law nor the application of other methods of external force.

(e) The co-operative movement or general organization recognizes the following doctrines and principles, derived from the Holy Scriptures, to be fundamental to the Christian message:

(1) The Fatherhood of God, revealed in His Son Jesus Christ, and the sonship bestowed by God, through Christ, upon all who believe in Him.

(2) The true Godhead of Jesus Christ, and His redemption of the world by His life and death and resurrection; and His living presence in His Church.

(3) The continued activity of God the Holy Spirit among men, calling them into the fellowship of Jesus Christ, and enlightening and sanctifying them through the gifts of His Grace.

(4) The supreme importance of the Word of God and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as the means through which the Holy Spirit testifies of Christ and thus creates and strengthens faith. (In common with the whole Evangelical Lutheran Church, we confess the mystery of the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and we invite all Christians to a renewed study of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures concerning this Sacrament, and the Sacrament of Holy Baptism.)

(5) The authority of the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only rule and standard by which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged.

(6) The reality and universality of sin, and the inability of men, because of sin, to attain righteousness or earn salvation through their own character or works.

(7) The love, and the righteousness, of God, Who for Christ's sake bestows forgivness and righteousness upon all who believe in Christ.

(8) The present existence upon earth of the Kingdom of God, founded by His Son Jesus Christ, not as an external organization, but as a spiritual reality and an object of faith.

(9) The hope of Christ's second coming, to be the judge of the living and the dead, and to complete the Kingdom of God.

4. That the Lutheran World Convention urge the Lutheran Churches of the world to maintain a united front in combatting militant ecclesiasticism wherever it seeks to invade evangelical ranks or with politico-ecclesiastical measures to oppress evangelical minorities, and that the Lutheran World Convention authorize and implement a special agency to have charge of this matter.

--Lutheran World Almanac, 1934-1937, pp. 36-38.

MINNEAPOLIS THESES

III. Church-Fellowship

1. These synods agree that true Christians are found in every denomination which has so much of divine truth revealed in Holy Scripture that children of God can be born in it; that according to the Word of God and our Confessions, church-fellowship, that is, mutual recognition, altar- and pulpit-fellowship, and eventually cooperation in the strictly essential work of the Church presupposes unanimity in the pure doctrine of the Gospel and in the confession of the same in word and deed.

Where the establishment and maintenance of church-fellowship ignores present doctrinal differences or declares them a matter of indifference, there is unionism, pretense of union which does not exist.

2. They agree that the rule 'Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran pastors only and Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants only' is not only in full accord with, but necessarily implied in, the teachings of the divine Word and the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. This rule, implying the rejection of all unionism and syncretism, must be observed as setting forth a principle elementary to sound and conservative Lutheranism.

--Doctrinal Declarations, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., pp. 20-21.

APPENDIX II

MINUTES AND REPORTS OF ECUMENICAL ORGANIZATIONS

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THIRTY-FIVE

At their separate sessions held in August and September 1936, in successive weeks, the Universal Council for Life and Work, and the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, passed Resolutions commending the appointment of a Committee to review the work of ecumenical co-operation since the Stockholm and Lausanne Conferences, and to report to the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences regarding the future of the ecumenical movement.

It was further agreed that this Committee should be appointed by a group representing various ecumenical movements, and should consist mainly of persons holding positions of ecclesiastical responsibility in the different Churches, but should also contain representatives of the view-point of laymen, women and youth, and some officers of the ecumenical movements.

The group designated for this purpose, after consultation with the leaders of the movements and of the Churches, constituted the Committee, known as the 'Committee of Thirty-Five.' This 'Committee of Thirty-Five' met for a two-day session at Westfield College, Hampstead, London, on 8th, 9th and 10th July 1937 and unanimously recommended that each of the two World Conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh should adopt certain proposals for the foundation of a World Council of Churches, as follows:

1. That the Conference regards it as desirable that, with a view to facilitating the most effective action of the Christian Church in the modern world, the movements known as 'Life and Work' and 'Faith and Order' should be more closely related in a body representative of the Churches and caring for the interests of each movement.

2. That the Conference approves generally the following Memorandum:

The new organisation which is proposed shall have no power to legislate for the Churches or to commit them to action without their consent; but if it is to be effective, it must deserve and win the respect of the Churches in such measure that the people of greatest influence in the life of the Churches may be willing to give time and thought to its work.

Further, the witness which the Church in the modern world is called to give is such that in certain spheres the predominant voice in the utterance of it must be that of lay people, holding posts of responsibility and influence in the secular world.

For both these reasons a first-class Intelligence Staff is indispensable in order that material for discussion and action may be adequately prepared.

There are certain ecumenical movements, such as the I.M.C., the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, the W.S.C.F., the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A. and the Central Bureau for Inter-Church Aid with which the new body should enter into relationship, both in order that the life in them may flow into the Churches and that those movements may derive stability and true perspective from the Churches. The actual approach to these would need to be determined with regard to the basis and function of each.

We regard as parts of the responsibility of the new body:

(i) To carry on the work of the two World Conferences.
(ii) To facilitate corporate action by the Churches.
(iii) To promote co-operation in study.
(iv) To promote the growth of ecumenical consciousness in the Churches.
(v) To consider the establishment of an ecumenical journal.
(vi) To consider the establishment of communication with denominational federations of world-wide scope as well as with the movements named in the preceding paragraph.
(vii) To call World Conferences on specific subjects as occasion requires.

3. That the Conference approves the establishment of a World Council of Churches functioning through the following bodies:

(i) A General Assembly of representatives of the Churches (in accordance with a plan to be determined later) of approximately two hundred members meeting every five years.

(ii) A Central Council of (approximately) sixty members which shall be a Committee of the General Assembly when constituted (Footnote: The constitution for the General Assembly shall be worked out by the Central Council in consultation with the Churches and the national Christian organisations.), meeting annually, e.g.:

(a) Twelve from North America appointed through the Federal Council.
(b) Nine from Great Britain, appointed in such a manner as the Churches in Great Britain may decide.
(c) Eighteen from the countries on the Continent of Europe (to be assigned to the different countries).
(d) Nine representing the Orthodox Churches.
(e) Six representing the younger Churches (to be appointed on the advice of the I.M.C.).
(f) Six representing South Africa, Australasia and areas not otherwise represented

(One-third of the representatives in each case to be laymen or women, so far as possible. In the event of the number of laymen and women elected being less than one-third of the total, the Council shall allot to one or more of the appointing bodies additional places up to the number of ten to be filled by laymen or women.)

(iii) A commission for the further study of Faith and Order subjects to be appointed at Edinburgh, and vacancies to be filled by the Central Council.

(iv) A Commission for the further study of Life and Work subjects to be appointed by the Central Council, with a view to facilitating common Christian action.

4. That power be given to the Central Council to call into such relationship with itself as may seem good, other ecumenical movements.

5. That pending the creation of any new organisation, each movement shall carry on its own activities through its own staff.

6. That the Conference appoint a Constituent Committee of seven members to co-operate with a similar committee appointed at Edinburgh (or Oxford) to complete the details and to bring the scheme into existence.

N.B.--It is suggested that the General Assembly should approve the scheme for the Central Council, but should invite the constituents as described in Section 2 to appoint the members of that Council in accordance with the scheme.

--The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937, pp. 272-274.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO WHICH THE CONFERENCE REFFERRED THE REPORT OF THE 'COMMITTEE OF THIRTY-FIVE' As approved by the Full Conference with one dissentient on Wednesday, 11th August 1937

Consideration has been given to the fact that the desire for closer relations between the two movements--Faith and Order and Life and Work--originated in their own councils and led to the formation of the Committee of Thirty-Five to consider the future relations of the two movements. That Committee has submitted a plan for a World Council of Christian Churches. The chief inducements for this proposed closer relationship have been that the two movements or conferences in carrying out their commissions, as received from the Churches, have learned that they have many interests and purposes in common and are closely interrelated. It has also been learned that in the appeal to the Churches for continued interest and support the question is often naturally asked why there should be two world movements when the lay mind does not understand and appreciate their distinctive functions.

Although we have doubts about some details in the plan proposed--for example, the composition of the proposed central council and the method of appointing its members- we do not deem it worth while to single them out, as they can be remedied in the process which our Committee suggests in bringing the plan to completeness.

The terms of our appointment by the participating Churches preclude our formal approval of the proposed plan for a World Council. Therefore:

I. We recommend that the Conference: (1) Give a sympathetic welcome to the general plan without committing itself to details. (2) Commend it to the favourable consideration of the Churches.

II. We further recommend that the Conference, through its Arrangements Committee, appoint a committee of seven members who shall co-operate with a similar committee appointed by the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work to form a 'Constituent Committee' of fourteen, whose duties shall be: (1) To revise and complete the details of the plan for a World Council. (2) To submit the completed plan to the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order. (3) To arrange for the submission of the completed plan to the Churches when it is approved by the Continuation Committee. (4) To convene the World Council when it is approved by the Churches.

III. We also recommend that the Continuation Committee of this Conference be instructed: (1) To instruct its Secretary, when he receives the completed plan from the Constituent Committee, to circulate it to all the members of the Continuation Committee, after which the Committee shall take prompt action either as a body or through its Executive Committee. (2) To give approval to the completed plan only if the following guarantees be incorporated: (a) That the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order shall, in the first instance, be the Continuation Committee appointed by this Conference. (b) In any further appointments made by the Council to membership of the Commission on Faith and Order, the persons appointed shall always be members of the Churches which fall within the terms of the Faith and Order invitation as addressed to 'all Christian bodies throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour.' (c) The work of the Commission on Faith and Order shall be carried on under the general care of a Theological Secretariat appointed by the Commission, in consultation with the Council and acting in close co-operation with other secretariats of the Council. The Council shall make adequate financial provision for the work of the Commissioh after consultation with the Commission. (d) In matters of common interest to all the Churches and pertaining to Faith and Order, the Council shall always proceed in accordance with the basis on which this Conference on Faith and Order was called and is being conducted. (e) The World Council shall consist of official representatives of the Churches participating. (f) Any Council formed before the first meeting of the General Assembly shall be called Provisional, and the Assembly, representing all the Churches, shall have complete freedom to determine the constitution of the Central Council.

--The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937, pp. 270-272. The report as first presented, pp. 197-199.

CONSTITUTION FOR THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

In Process of Formation

V. Organisation

The World Council shall discharge its functions through the following bodies:

(i) An Assembly which shall be the principal authority in the Council, and shall ordinarily meet every five years. The Assembly shall be composed of official representatives of the Churches or groups of Churches adhering to it and directly appointed by them. It shall consist of not more than 450 members who shall be apportioned as is provided hereafter. They shall serve for five years, their term of service beginning in the year before the Assembly meets.

The membership shall be allocated provisionally as follows:

85, representing the Orthodox Churches throughout the world, allocated in such manner as they may decide;

110, representing the Churches of the Continent of Europe, allocated in such manner as they may decide;

60, representing the Churches of Great Britain and Eire, allocated in such manner as they may decide;

90, representing the Churches of the United States of America and Canada, allocated in such manner as they may decide;

50, representing the Churches of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Pacific Islands, to be appointed by them as they may decide;

25, representing the Churches of South Africa, Australasia and areas not otherwise represented, to be appointed by them, such places to be allocated by the Central Committee;

and,not more than 30 members representing minority Churches, which in the judgment of the Central Committee are not granted adequate representation by the above provisions of this section, such Churches to be designated by the world confessional organisations.

The Assembly shall have power to appoint Officers of the World Council and of the Assembly at its discretion.

The members of the Assembly shall be both clerical and lay persons--men and women. In order to secure that approximately one third of the Assembly shall consist of lay persons, the Central Committee, in consultation with the different areas and groups, shall suggest plans to achieve this end.

(ii) A Central Committee which shall consist of not more than 90 members designated by the Churches, or groups of Churches, from among persons whom these Churches have elected as members of the Assembly. They shall serve from the beginning of the Assembly meeting until the next Assembly, unless the Assembly otherwise determine. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Central Committee shall be filled by the Churches or group of Churches concerned. This Committee shall be a Committee of the Assembly. The Assembly shall have authority to modify the allocation of members of the Central Committee as herein provided, both as to the manner and as to the ratio of the allocation.

The membership shall be allocated provisionally as follows:

17, of whom at least 3 shall be lay persons, representing the Orthodox Churches throughout the world, allocated in such manner as they may decide;

22, of whom at least 5 shall be lay persons, representing the Churches of the Continent of Europe, allocated in such manner as they may decide;

12, of whom at least 4 shall be lay persons, representing the Churches of Great Britain and Eire allocated in such manner as they may decide;

18, of whom at least 5 shall be lay persons, representing the Churches of the United States of America and Canada, allocated in such manner as they may decide;

10, of whom at least 2 shall be lay persons, representing the Churches of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Pacific Islands, to be appointed by them as they may decide;

5, of whom at least 2 shall be lay persons, representing the Churches of South Africa, Australasia and areas not otherwise represented, to be appointed by them, such places to be allocated by the Central Committee;

and, not more than 6 members representing minority Churches, which in the judgment of the Central Committee are not granted adequate representation by the above provisions of this section, such Churches to be designated by the world confessional organisations.

The Central Committee shall have the following powers:

(a) It shall, between meetings of the Assembly, carry out the Assembly's instructions and exercise its functions, except that of amending the Constitution or modifying the allocation of its own members.

(b) It shall be the finance committee of the Assembly formulating its budget and securing its financial support.

(c) It shall name and elect its own Officers from among its members and appoint its own secretarial staff.

(d) The Central Committee shall meet normally once every calendar year, and shall have power to appoint its own Executive Committee.

Quorum.--No business, except what is required for carrying forward the current activities of the Council, shall be transacted in either the Assembly or the Central Committee unless one half of the total membership is present.

--The World Council of Churches, Its Process of Formation, Geneva, 1946, pp. 175-178.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
As Amended and Adopted At Amsterdam, 1948

V. Organisation

The World Council shall discharge its functions through the following bodies:

(i) An Assembly which shall be the principal authority in the Council, and shall ordinarily meet every five years. The Assembly shall be composed of official representatives of the churches or groups of churches adhering to it and directly appointed by them. Their term of office shall begin in the year before the Assembly meets, and they shall serve until their successors are appointed. It shall consist of members whose number shall be determined by each Assembly for the subsequent Assembly, subject to the right of the Assembly to empower the Central Committee, if it thinks fit, to increase or to diminish the said number by not more than twenty percent. The number shall be finally determined not less than two years before the meeting of the Assembly to which it refers and shall be apportioned as is provided hereafter.

Seats in the Assembly shall be allocated to the member churches by the Central Committee, due regard being given to such factors as numerical size, adequate confessional representation and adequate geographical distribution. Suggestions for readjustment in the allocation of seats may be made to the Central Committee by member churches or by groups of member churches, confessional, regional or national, and these readjustments shall become effective if approved by the Central Committee after consultation with the churches concerned.

The Assembly shall have power to appoint officers of the World Council and of the Assembly at its discretion.

The members of the Assembly shall be both clerical and lay persons--men and women. In order to secure that approximately one-third of the Assembly shall consist of lay persons, the Central Committee, in allocating to the member churches their places in the Assembly, shall strongly urge each church, if possible, to observe this provision.

(ii) A Central Committee which shall be a Committee of the Assembly and which shall consist of the President or Presidents of the World Council, together with not more than ninety members chosen by the Assembly from among persons whom the churches have appointed as members of the Assembly. They shall serve until the next Assembly, unless the Assembly otherwise determines. Membership in the Central Committee shall be distributed among the member churches by the Assembly, due regard being given to such factors as numerical size, adequate confessional representation and adequate geographical distribution. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Central Committee between meetings of the Assembly shall be filled by the Central Committee upon nomination of the church or churches concerned.

The Central Committee shall have the following powers: (a) It shall, between meetings of the Assembly, carry out the Assembly's instruction and exercise its functions, except that of amending the Constitution, or modifying the allocation of its own members; (b) It shall be the finance committee of the Assembly formulating its budget and securing its financial support; (c) It shall name and elect its own Officers from among its members and appoint its own secretarial staff; (d) The Central Committee shall meet normally once every calendar year, and shall have power to appoint its own Executive Committee. Quorum: No business, except what is required for carrying forward the current activities of the Council, shall be transacted in either the Assembly or the Central Committee unless one-half of the total membership is present.

--The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Amsterdam, 1948, pp. 198-200.

MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSAL FOR CONFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION
Presented To Provisional Committee, February 1946

A proposal made by the presidents of eight Lutheran bodies in America on September 6, 1945, petitions that the World Council's Constitution 'be amended so as to provide for Lutheran representation in both the Assembly and the Central Committee on a confessional basis.' No definition is given as to what would constitute 'representation ... on a confessional basis' but Rev. Dr. Franklin C. Fry, president of the United Lutheran Church of America, in discussing the matter in Geneva on December 8, 1945, stated that the Lutherans would be satisfied if a single change were made in the Constitution, - viz. an assignment of a definite number of seats in the Assembly and in the Central Committee to 'Lutherans', - as is now done in the case of the Eastern Orthodox. He also agreed that the various Churches in different nations might continue to join the Council as separate units, each making its own independent decision, provided the detailed allocation of seats within the total Lutheran group might be made by the Lutheran World Convention.

The Lutheran proposal, therefore, does not require that the basis of membership be changed. It requires only a new arrangement for representation after the Churches have become members.

The Provisional Committee, of course, has no authority to amend the Constitution. The first Assembly must therefore be organized on the basis outlined in the Constitution drafted at Utrecht. The Provisional Committee however, may submit an amendment to the first assembly for its consideration.

If it is deemed desirable to make an adjustment to meet the Lutheran request, this could be done by revising the Constitution in one of two ways:

1. A possible procedure would be to abandon the principle of geographical distribution, set forth in Article V of the Utrecht Constitution, and to substitute therefor a table of allocations to confessional families based on their relative numerical strength, with a provision also for an allocation to churches not organized in confessional families. Perhaps it would also be necessary to require that the Central Committee be consulted with regard to the proposed distribution of seats within the confessional families in order to ensure an appropriate representation for each geographical area as a whole, - e.g. for the Far East and Latin America.

2. An alternative procedure would be to eliminate from the Constitution any attempt to make a specific allocation of seats in advance, whether on a confessional or a geographical basis, and to set forth only the basic principle of allocation according to numerical strength. In this case it would be necessary to authorize the Central Committee to determine the allocations after consultation with the several confessional organizations.

Each of these alternatives assumes that a distinction may be made between basis of membership in the Council and basis of representation in its Assembly and Central Committee. Whether the allocation of seats be on a geographical or a confessional basis, the member-units should continue to be individual churches. It is essential that the Council be grounded in the strongest existing ecclesiastical realities, which are the churches in the national areas.

It is recommended that the Provisional Committee:

1) Receive the request of the American Lutherans with sympathetic appreciation and provide for further study of the basis on which seats in the Assembly and the Central Committee should be assigned.

2) Request the Committee on arrangements for the first Assembly to consider whether an amendment of Article V of

the Constitution should be submitted to the Assembly, and to report the results of its inquiry to the next meeting of the Provisional Committee.

--Copy of Memorandum "Prov. Ctee. 46 11"
in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg.

EXCERPT FROM MINUTES OF PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE MEETING, FEBRUARY 1946

Proposal concerning confessional representation

The Sub-Committee next reported on the proposal made by the presidents of eight Lutheran bodies in America on September 6th, 1945 to the effect that the World Council's Constitution "be amended so as to provide for Lutheran representation in both the Assembly and the Central Committee on a confessional basis." It was explained that this proposal would involve that a definite number of seats in the Assembly and in the Central Committee would be assigned to the Lutheran Churches, as is now done in the case of the Orthodox Churches.

After considerable discussion, during which several Lutheran members stated their reasons for the proposal, it was finally agreed that the Provisional Committee:

(a) Receive the petition of the American Lutherans with sympathetic appreciation, take note of the action of the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention in December 1945 directing that the proposal be presented to its member-churches for earnest consideration, and request further information as to the results of this consideration.

(b) Request the Committee on Arrangements for the first Assembly to consider whether an amendment to Article V of the Constitution should be submitted to the Assembly, and to report the result of its inquiry to the next meeting of the Provisional Committee.

--*The World Council of Churches, Its Process of Formation,* Geneva, 1946, p. 53.

EXCERPT FROM MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS, HORSHAM, 1946

3. Participation.-

(a) Official Church delegates.-

Dr. Visser 't Hooft said that the Constitution stated that the Assembly should consist of not more than 450 members and that the members of the Assembly should be both clerical and lay members, men and women. He thought it was not laid down whether every Church that was a member of the World Council should have at least one delegate, but Dr. Koechlin said that in the Constitution adopted at Utrecht it was agreed that the Assembly should be composed of official representatives of the Churches or groups of Churches, and that here the possibility was conceived that some Churches might be only indirectly represented.

Dr. Visser 't Hooft asked if it was felt that all Churches should have at least one representative - he thought it was necessary for the first meeting but was not sure about it as a good precedent for the future. However, it was not this Committee's province to legislate for the future, and it was therefore decided that a request should be made that in allocating the seats in the different areas provision should be made for each member Church to have at least one member present at the meeting.

A long discussion followed on the best method of allocation. It was proposed that:

(a) the North American allocation should be arranged through the American Committee and the Canadian Committee,

(b) Great Britain through the British Council of Churches,

(c) the Younger Churches-to ask those who attended the I.M.C. meeting in the summer of 1947 to suggest an allocation,

(d) the Churches on the Continent - to be discussed.

Dr. Van Dusen said that the relationship of the Provisional Committee must be with individual churches through regional units of some kind, but there was nothing to prevent a group of Churches joining with another group to choose a block of representatives. If, for example, the American Lutheran Churches wanted to choose non-American Lutherans they probably had power to do so.

Bishop Neill did not agree. He said that the general principle that the representation was territorial was quite clear.

Dr. Wentz urged as an alternative, the method of Confessional representation, suggesting, for example, that within the 110 representatives allowed by the Constitution to the Churches of the Continent of Europe, those churches desiring confessional representation should be assigned a certain number.

Bishop Neill said that the question before the Committee was whether an amendment was to be proposed to the Assembly concerning the basis of representation, and that it was for the Assembly to decide; but that the allocation for the first assembly, under the present Constitution, must be territorial.

Dr. Wentz then asked if a simple amendment could not be made to Article V of the Constitution, by inserting a paragraph, following the reference to the Orthodox Churches, as follows: "...so many representing the Lutheran Churches adhering to the Lutheran World Federation, allocated in such manner as they may decide."

This provoked a long discussion. Dr. Wentz was asked to explain fully why the American Lutherans had made this proposal, and he made a statement based on the petition presented to the Provisional Committee at the meeting in Geneva last February. The first part of it stated that the allocation of seats in the Assembly and in the Central Committee were both provisional, implying that either the numbers or the method of allocation was open to change. The allocation was really on three different bases - (1) Confessional, where the Orthodox Churches were mentioned by name, (2) territorial, (3) the World Confessional organisations nominating representatives for minority churches. The petitioners simply asked for an extension of the first of these three principles, and they believed that if this petition were granted it would eliminate the third principle. They did not ask that any World Confessional organisation should become a member of the World Council - there need be no mention of the Lutheran World Federation. They did not ask for disproportionate representation for Lutherans - they would take any figure given to them. They did not insist that other churches should be represented in this way, although they believed it would be better if they were so represented. They merely asked that the first of the three principles should be expanded to cover those churches who wished to use it. Their reasons were (1) because of what the World Council professed to be, (2) because of what the World Council proposed to do. Both Constitution and explanatory memorandum clearly indicated that the Council was a Fellowship of Churches, not a platform for contacts among regional segments of Christendom. It was to the Churches that the invitations went as individual ecclesiastical bodies that joined the Council. The logic of this would seem to be that any representation should be by Churches or groups of Churches rather than by regional segments of Christendom or some other device. There must be groups, but they should be of Churches and not of Regions. If the Ecumenical movement was to be saved from becoming just another Christian movement outside of the Churches it must be constituted directly of the churches which have accepted membership and the churches directly appoint their representatives and determine the policies of the Council. There were countries which would never hear of the World Council except as it would be brought to their notice by the Lutheran World Federation. If this petition were granted the Lutheran World Federation would see that all of them became conscious of the World Council. They believed in this way they would help the World Council to be a Council of Churches. One important function of the World Council was to mobilize the Church of Christ for concrete action. The Lutherans thought they could do it with more force if they did it through the Lutheran World Federation than through separate representation in the Assembly.

Dr. Wentz went on to say that this petition had been received "with sympathetic appreciation" at Geneva and the American Lutherans were asked to see how many of the Lutheran Churches of the world desired to join them in the petition. He gave a list of the Lutheran Churches which endorsed the petition: France, Australia, Holland, Poland, Sweden, Norway, Finland. There was practically the unanimous vote of all the churches that could be reached at the present time. They were asking that the Lutheran Churches should be allowed to pool their seats, however many were allotted to them, and they would assign them. He again proposed an amendment to the Constitution under Article V, the insertion of the paragraph: "... so many representing the Churches adhering to the Lutheran World Federation and allocated in such manner as they may decide."

Dr. Cavert said there were at least three possibilities to consider:

(1) to put the Lutherans on the same basis as the Orthodox, but make no further change in Article V,

(2) to change entirely from territorial to confessional representation,

(3) to combine the two methods in a way which would permit those Churches which wanted to do so to go in on a confessional basis and leaving the others on a territorial basis.

Dr. Visser 't Hooft said he thought Dr. Wentz's proposal was only a different way of getting Lutherans to the Assembly and that once they were there he did not see it made any difference whether they had been got there one way or another.

Dr. Wentz felt that some of the small Lutheran churches would come to better expression in the proposed manner.

Dr. 't Hooft said that in any case the Committee would write to the Lutheran World Federation and ask for advice as to which churches should be invited. He did not think the implied criticism of the present Constitution was a valid one.

Bishop Neill said that if a new basis of representation were granted to the Lutherans, the Anglican Church would have to consider its attitude - so would the Presbyterians and the other confessional bodies, - and the group of younger Churches would be dissolved in the confessional groupings. He pressed for a realisation of the very wide scope of the proposed amendment, which would alter in a sense the entire form which the World Council took and presented to the world. He said that under the present arrangement the members were prepared to regard themselves as One Church, and the method of representation was just a convenience, but if they had to say "We are the Anglican Church, the Lutheran Church, the Orthodox Church and so on" did it not constitute a segregation into blocs?

Dr. Leiper was inclined to favour the confessional method in so far as it got away from nationalism and would make it easier for the churches to grow together if they saw themselves always on a world level.

The Chairman, when asked to sketch in the background of the present situation, said that at Utrecht the issue of confessional representation was pushed very strongly by the United Lutheran Church of America. At that time, however, there was not a general Lutheran demand for it, at least not among European Lutherans. In any case, there was not an extensive discussion of the issue at Utrecht. He asked whether the best procedure might not be a complete rewriting of Article V so that it would read somewhat as follows: "Seats in the World Council Assembly shall be allocated to the member Churches by the Central Committee, due regard being had to such factors as numerical size, adequate confessional representation and adequate geographical representation."

Mrs. Bliss brought forward the point of view of the situation in a local community where the Churches had to live together. She thought that open Confessionalism might lead the people to feel they had done their full duty to the World Council of Churches if they were good Methodists or Anglicans or Lutherans and that they were therefore absolved from the responsibility of working with other churches in their home town.

Dr. Wentz could not agree that Ecumenicity meant that denominational boundaries should be dissolved.

Dr. Cavert then again brought forward his alternative suggestion and asked whether it would be an acceptable way of meeting the considerations which the Lutherans had in mind. He urged in its support that it would have the special merit of emphasizing the direct relation between the Assembly and the member-churches of the Council.

Dr. Wentz said he would consider it.

It was finally agreed to recommend that the following amendment to Article V should be submitted for consideration:

"Seats in the Assembly shall be allocated by the Central Committee to the member Churches, due regard being given to such factors as numerical size, adequate confessional representation and adequate geographical distribution. Suggestions for readjustment in allocation of seats may be made to the Central Committee by member Churches or by groups of Churches, - confessional, regional or international, - and these shall become effective if approved by the Central Committee and the member Churches concerned."

The following amendment should also be suggested in regard to paragraph (ii) of Article V, as follows:

"Seats in the Central Committee shall be allocated by the Assembly, due regard being given to such factors as numerical size, adequate confessional representation and adequate geographical distribution. Suggestions for changes in the composition of the Committee may be made by member Churches or by groups of Churches, - confessional, regional or international."

--Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on the Arrangements for the Assembly, St. Julians, Horsham, July 31st - August 1st, 1946, pp. 11-15.

STATEMENT ON NATURE AND PURPOSE OF WCC
April 1947

The World Council of Churches, composed of churches which acknowledge Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, owes its existence to the desire of its member Churches to express their unity in Him. The Council seeks to promote this unity among its members and to serve them as an organ whereby they may bear witness together to their common faith and co-operate in matters requiring united action. The Council does not aim, however, to usurp the functions which belong to its constituent members, nor in any way to control or legislate for these bodies. Moreover, while earnestly seeking the co-operation and unity of all the churches that accept its basis, the Council disavows any thought of becoming a single unified church structure dominated by a centralised administrative authority.

The Christian unity for which the Council stands is of a different order. It strives after a unity in which Christians and Christian churches, joyously aware of their oneness in Jesus Christ their Lord, and pursuing an ever fuller realisation and expression of that oneness, shall in times of need give help and comfort to one another, and at all times inspire and exhort one another to live worthily of their common membership in the Body of Christ.

With respect to public pronouncements, the Council regards it as an essential part of its responsibility to address its own attention in the realm of thought or action, "not as having dominion of their faith, but as helpers of their joy." The Council further considers itself responsible to Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, to seek to know the Will of God upon important issues which radically affect the Church and society, and thereafter, in the name of Christ, in dependence upon the Holy Spirit, and in penitence and faith, to call upon churches, governments or men in general, as the situation may require, to deal with a given historical issue, in the name of Christ and in the light of God's revelation in Jesus Christ the Lord.

--A Statement of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches adopted at its meeting at Buck Hill Falls on April 25th, 1947 from Minutes and Reports of the Meeting of the Provisional Committee, of the World Council of Churches, Buck Hill Falls, Penn., April 1947, p. 90.

EXCERPTS FROM DOCUMENTS, AMSTERDAM 1948

F. Proposed Amendments To Article V

The Provisional Committee gives notice of proposed amendments to Article V, as follows:

(a) Omit the entire portion which allocates seats in the Assembly to the various areas, beginning: 'The membership shall be allocated provisionally as follows' and ending 'such Churches to be designated by the world confessional organisations', and substitute therefor the following paragraph:

"Seats in the Assembly shall be allocated to the member Churches by the Central Committee, due regard being given to such factors as numerical size, adequate confessional representation and adequate geographical distribution. Suggestions for readjustment in the allocation of seats may be made to the Central Committee by member Churches or by groups of member Churches, confessional, regional or national, and these readjustments shall become effective if approved by the Central Committee and the member Churches concerned."

(b) Substitute in section (ii) for the first paragraph and for the section dealing with allocation of seats in the

Central Committee, ending with the words 'such Churches to be designated by the world confessional organisations', the following paragraph:

"(ii) A Central Committee, which shall be a committee of the Assembly and which shall consist of not more than 90 members chosen by the Assembly from among persons whom the Churches have appointed as members of the Assembly. They shall serve until the next Assembly, unless the Assembly otherwise determine. Membership in the Central Committee shall be distributed among the member Churches by the Assembly, due regard being given to such factors as numerical size, adequate confessional representation and adequate geographical distribution. Any vacancy ocurring in the membership of the Central Committee between meetings of the Assembly shall be filled by the Central Committee upon nomination of the Church or Churches concerned."

Commentary

This amendment represents the most important change which is proposed. The original constitution emphasised the principle of geographical representation. The proposed amendment does not do away with that principle, but introduces other important principles. In allocating seats in the Assembly and in distributing membership in the Central Committee, due regard will have to be given to various factors which include the confessional and geographical ones. The amendment implies that the distribution of seats in the two main bodies can be restudied from time to time in the light of new circumstances. A further change is that the members of the Central Committee are chosen by the Assembly rather than by the Churches. The advantage of this provision is that the Central Committee can begin to function immediately after or even during the Assembly. The original provision that members of the Central Committee must be persons appointed by the Churches as members of the Assembly, remains unchanged.

--Documents of the World Council of Churches, First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Amsterdam, 1948, p. 21.

APPENDIX III

ARTICLES, LETTERS, MEMORANDA

Knubel's Letter to Westman, 1922

Realizing that all of us have deep concern for such matters as are involved in this proposed Conference, it seemed good to me to write my views, which express, I believe, the position of the United Lutheran Church in America.

In the first place, then, the United Lutheran Church is by no means unmindful of its responsibilities toward Christians in denominational groups outside of the Lutheran Church. We have earnestly and prayerfully studied how we ought and may fulfil those responsibilities. This effort on our part found its first important development in the adoption at our Washington Convention two years ago of a Declaration of Principles Concerning the Church and Its External Relationships. On the basis of that Declaration we have been aiming to work out in a practical way our attitude. We have, for instance, now assumed a certain kind of relationship to the Federal Council of the Churches without feeling able at present to take full membership in that Council. Our reasons for this step are given in a lengthy action of the Executive Board of the United Lutheran Church, a copy of which action is also enclosed herewith. I am sending this because it reveals some of the important difficulties which Lutherans in this country experience in their relationship with Christians in other denominations. I ought to add that the proposition of the United Lutheran Church has been accepted by the Federal Council and that we are therefore always listed by the Federal Council as holding a consultative relationship with them.

In the second place, the United Lutheran Church has hitherto refrained from taking active part in relationship to other denominations whenever movements have been planned which extend beyond America, which are international in their character. Thus, for instance, we have taken no positive steps in such matters as the Faith and Order Movement and the Conference on Life and Work. One of the important reasons for our hesitancy concerning these international movements is that we have steadily hoped for the possibility that the Lutherans of the world might come to some common understanding as to the attitude which we ought to assume toward these movements. The

United Lutheran Church has been urging the holding of an International Lutheran Convention. Our desire is that at such a convention we shall be able to reach a more or less clear understanding upon the basis of which we can unitedly proceed and thus unitedly have the strongest influence. We have noted of course, that the Church of Sweden and other Lutheran groups in Europe have been represented in such international plans. We have noted especially Archbishop Söderblom's towering influence. Our hearts, however, are very desirous that there might come to be a combined pressure of the Lutheranism of the world influencing and shaping these movements. In common with you we recognize that there is a great necessity for which Lutheranism lives in the world. We recognize that there is great necessity, especially at the present time, to testify for the truth we know before other Christians. We recognize that there is a great necessity that we as Lutherans shall determine together, and in the presence of our Lord, what our right position is. These are some of the reasons which make us long for an International Lutheran Convention. We believe that at such a Pan-Lutheran Convention we of America shall have much to learn from the Lutherans of Europe. We believe also that there are some things which we can show our brethren in Europe especially as concerns American Protestantism.

In the third place, I believe I ought to say to you that as American Lutherans we have been studying very earnestly these various international Christian movements, especially those which have had their origin in America. You well know how many of these movements originated here and how many of them have been strongly pressed here. Permit me, as briefly as possible, to enumerate some of our fears concerning them without any mention of our favorable thoughts regarding them.

(a) The great number of those movements and conferences constantly arising has the inevitable result of distracting the Church, consuming its energy and using up its time and man-power.

(b) Many of these activities would seem to lead to little more than a significant display on the part of the Church before the world.

(c) In many movements we note a growing and dangerous disregard of the representative principle. We mean thereby that the membership in these movements, especially from America, is very frequently not at all representative of the Church Bodies themselves. In addition to regular representatives very often many additional members are named by the movements or organizations themselves, under the terms Co-opted, Corresponding, At Large, Advisory, Affiliated. The neglect of the representative principle constitutes in reality a despising of the Church.

(d) Naturally, as Lutherans we are always responsive to any proposition which bears the name and the character of a conference. However, if suggestions for conferences become too frequent even they absorb the time of the Church. Furthermore conferences to be of value ought to be lengthy. A few days of conference and discussion can accomplish little.

(e) Sometimes we are inclined to think that the tendency of present movements is altogether too much along the idea of the approach of the Churches to another from the top down. There is too little consciousness of the need for Christian union from the bottom up. In other words, the real unity of Christians within congregations, within local territories and within individual denominations themselves receives scant attention.

(f) One other difficulty which confronts us is that which is fully stated in the decision of the United Lutheran Church's Executive Board concerning the Federal Council. In other words, to state it briefly, faith and its confession are neglected or minimized. As Lutherans we well know their importance in the life of the Church and in all plans for relationships. Such neglect is quite characteristic of American Protestantism. As concerns the Conference on Life and Work, we note that it is proposed to avoid such discussion, although, indeed, there is frequent mention in American publications concerning the Conference, of the desire to know the "mind of Christ" upon the various problems. All will recognize that any consideration of the mind of Christ must involve a consideration of those things which go to make up our Christian faith and its confession.

Let me repeat once more that in enumerating above our fears I have made no mention whatsoever of reasons which urge us favorably towards these various movements. Ere I conclude, however, let me say that we are greatly influenced by what I have stated above in my second division concerning the desire for a common understanding on the part of Lutherans throughout the world.

--ULCA Minutes, 1922, pp. 92-94

Knubel's Letter Asking Wentz to Draw up Statement on Lutherans and Ecumenical Movements, 1936

You know that when we met in Buffalo I suggested the possibility that when the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention meets it should consider the desirable attitude of Lutheran bodies throughout the world towards so called ecumenical movements and towards general Church activities of every nature. I wrote to Bishop Marahrens and you may recall that the suggestion was received favorably by the European men. This being true I believe we here in America ought to proceed now to the point of preparing a definite statement which can be submitted to the Executive Committee when it meets. We shall then be in no danger of wasting time through lost conversation. If you agree with this idea then Dr. Long and I request that you will undertake to prepare a statement. The other three will submit suggestions to you which you can add to your own thoughts. Your initial document can then be submitted to us for criticism and so finally reach a form to which all of us can subscribe.

Taking for granted that you will consent I am at once writing my own suggestions. I submit for your consideration that the aim of the paper must be to include definite reference first to the need of Lutheran solidarity in all countries and in the world. This necessity arises from our present difficulties and our present opportunities. It may be practically developed by an interchange of visits and other exchanges among the countries. We need however chiefly to cultivate in the hearts and minds of our people a consciousness of this solidarity so that they may be strengthened in their devotion to our common faith and so that they be ready to turn to the other Lutherans in the world rather than to other near neighbors of some other doctrinal persuasion.

As a second necessity we must recognize our responsibility to prepare for the future of Lutheranism in the world. I have been saying on several occasions that there are only two churches in existence which are actually entitled to the designation "universal." Those two churches are the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran. In any event those who are coming after us will properly blame us if we do not plan for them. Furthermore the Lutheran Church cannot have a future I fear unless it now undertakes to bring about a practical entente of Lutheran groups.

In the third place some arrangement ought to be planned whereby the Lutheran groups in the world will act in common, or at least harmoniously, as over against all existing groups and all ecumenical religious movements. This is the point I specified as insistently necessary when we had our meeting in Buffalo. I have in mind of course Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism, both of which are exercising strongly consolidated influences upon religious developments. The Reformed groups are also more or less working in unified efforts. The ecumenical movements like Faith and Order and Life and Work, etc., are well known. Unless Lutheranism undertakes some harmonious plans over against these she can scarcely be counted as faithful to the trust and the truth committed to her. I do not know if actual names of religious groups and movements ought to be specified in the statement but the statement ought to be so clear that no doubt could exist as to the groups and movements intended. We must remember also that new movements are likely to develop and that this statement of ours must prepare Lutherans everywhere for new movements as they arise. At the first conference held by the Faith and Order movement our Lutheran forces were consolidated and were therefore most influential at the meeting. At no other time has this been true to my knowledge. While we cannot dictate to our Lutheran groups or churches in the world we ought to at least advise them and this statement of our ought to have the force of strong advice.

As a fourth item it will no doubt be necessary to say that in our recognition of our solidarity as Lutherans and in our harmonious attitudes over against other religious groups we are not aiming in any sense whatsoever to develop political influence in the world or in particular countries. At this point there is much in your own recent address entitled "Our Church and Our Times" which might be used. That address has been carefully read by me and I recognize important values in many things you discuss or suggest.

The above represents in brief my suggestions as to the content of a statement. Turning briefly to the question of its formulation it must be statesmanlike. Although definitely as brief as possible it must be based on principle and therefore enduring in its value. A second question concerning the formulation is as to its presentation in the form of theses or as a connected paper somewhat like the Washington Declaration of the U.L.C.A. I believe you might well reexamine the Washington Declaration for anything it may contain that is of use. Examine also the statement on religious relationships adopted at Savannah. Examine furthermore any previous decisions of the Lutheran World Convantion at its three meetings.

The formulation must in the third place be practical. It cannot be philosophical or theoretical even though it is to state principles. My fourth and final suggestion as to the formulation has been mentioned above. It must be in the form of advice to Lutheran Churches throughout the world. The wording in this respect will be difficult lest the Lutheran World Convention appear to assume the rights of a superchurch.

--Letter from Knubel to Wentz, June 2, 1936,
in personal files of Wentz, Gettysburg

Memorandum of Administrative Committee of the Baptist World Alliance, 1938

1. The Administrative Committee of the Baptist World Alliance regards with anxiety the proposals for a "World Council of Churches" as set forth in the Memorandum on pages 279-281 of the Report of the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State.

2. It notes that the proposed World Council is to function through certain bodies, of which the chief are a General Assembly of approximately 200 members meeting every five years, and a Central Council of approximately 60 members meeting annually.

3. Obviously the Central Council will be in practice far more important than a General Assembly which is to meet only quinquennially.

4. In this Central Council the only provision for the European continental churches is through representatives "assigned to the different countries." This method of appointment involves that the majority churches must in all or almost all cases monopolize the representation.

5. The minority churches are however precisely the bodies which need an effective voice, since their freedom and even their existence may be imperiled (as in certain instances they have already been) by the attitude and influence of dominant churches, some of which are closely allied with States increasingly "totalitarian" in outlook.

6. Since the individual minority churches cannot be separately represented under the scheme, provision should be made that they shall be collectively represented through their international confessional organizations.

7. With regard to the representation of "the younger churches," the Administrative Committee on behalf of the Baptist World Alliance would call attention to the fact that in Asia, Africa (leaving aside British South Africa), and South America, there are Baptist churches containing according to the most recent statistics 614,298 communicant members, largely organized on territorial lines (in Ceylon, India, Burma, China, Nigeria, Brazil, etc.), but all included in the Baptist World Alliance. It would therefore appear that either the Baptist World Alliance as the international confessional body should have the right to nominate representatives, or (if the I.M.C. is interposed) that the I.M.C. should accept the nominees of the Baptist World Alliance.

8. While directing attention to these special points the Administrative Committee is constrained to go further and to record its agreement with the declaration of the Lutheran World Convention Executive Committee in its sessions at Amsterdam, August 24-29, 1937, that "representation in the proposed General Assembly, the proposed Central Committee, and the proposed Committees and Commissions, should be ecclesiastical and confessional and not territorial."

A body concerned with "Life and Work," and therefore bound to deal with issues involving international relations and policies in the political sphere, will find its deliverances regarded with suspicion so far as its members represent countries instead of international and in principle supranational confessional bodies. In a time of international tension, a Council appointed predominantly on national lines is likely either to split along the lines of the political separation of the countries represented by its members, or, because confronted with the grave danger of such a split, to be compelled to take refuge in an impotent and in the eyes of the world unworthy silence.

9. It will be observed that already the Confession is directly recognized in the arrangements for the representation of the Orthodox Churches.

--Memorandum on Proposed World Council Adopted by the Administrative Committee of the Baptist World Alliance at a session in London, January 31, 1938. Wentz's files, Gettysburg.

Dr. Wentz's "Brief" on Confessional Representation Submitted to Provisional Committee, February 1946

To the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches: A Petition Concerning Confessional Representation. Permit me to present to this Committee the petition of a group of Churches with which I am associated in the work of the Lutheran World Convention. It is a petition asking this Committee to propose to the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches an amendment to the provisional constitution. The desired amendment refers to the allocation of seats in the Assembly (Constitution V, 1) and the allocation of seats in the Central Committee (V, 2).

The Churches uniting in this petition are the Lutheran Churches in America which have already accepted the invitation to become members of the World Council; namely, the United Lutheran Church in America and the Augustana Synod, together with those which are ready to accept the invitation; namely, the American Lutheran, the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Free Church, the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Suomi Synod, and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church.

The constitutional convention at Utrecht did not fix finally the manner of allocating seats in the Assembly and in the Central Committee [of the World Council], but specifically stated that the allocations set down are "provisional." This suggests that change in the manner of allocation may become desirable in the light of further experience and information. Under this warrant your petitioners respectfully request a change in the manner of allocation, so far as it applies to your petitioners.

It will be observed that in the "provisional" allocation, both of seats in the Assembly and of those in the Central Committee, three different principles have been employed. One is the principle of representation by Churches, as in the case of "the Orthodox Churches throughout the world." Another is the principle of representation by territorial regions, as in the case of nearly all the other Churches. And the third is representation "designated by the World Confessional organizations," as in the case of "minority Churches which in the judgment of the Central Committee are not granted adequate representation" by either of the other two methods.

Your petitioners simply ask for an extension of the first of these principles, namely, representation by Churches, so that it may apply to Lutheran Churches throughout the world which may desire to employ it. We believe that if this petition is granted, it will eliminate the necessity for the third principle, that concerning minority Churches, so far as Lutheran Churches are concerned.

In order to define our position let me say:

(1) We do not ask that any World Confessional organization of Lutherans become a member of the World Council or be represented by the World Council;

(2) We do not ask for disproportionate representation of Lutherans from any country or in any category; and

(3) We do not insist that other Churches or Confessional groups must be represented in this way.

(4) We merely ask that the first of the three principles of representation be extended so as to apply to the Lutheran Churches which choose to use it.

Our reasons for this request are two:

I. Because of what the World Council professes to be.

(1) Both the constitution and the explanatory memorandum which was sent to the Churches when they were invited to join the Council clearly indicate that the Council is a fellowship of Churches. It is not a platform for contacts among regional segments of Christendom, not an ecclesiastical League of Nations. It was to the Churches that the invitations went, not to the Christians of the Continent of Europe, or to the Christians of Great Britain and Eire, and so forth. It was the Churches as individual ecclesiastical bodies that joined the Council. The logic of this would seem to be that any representation in the Council or its parts should be by Churches or groups of Churches rather than by regional segments of Christendom or some other device.

(2) The Continuation Committees of Faith-and-Order and Life-and-Work may have found it convenient to work in geographical sections, but they are not truly representative of the Churches, and the Churches as such do not feel any direct responsibility for their work. If the ecumenical movement is to be saved from becoming just another Christian movement above and outside the Churches, a mere platform where ecumenical specialists from various political divisions of the

world meet together as private individuals, the World Council must be constituted directly, not indirectly, of the Churches which have accepted membership and the Churches as such must directly appoint their representatives and determine the policies of the Council.

(3) If the logic of this is granted and if the member Churches as such are permitted to determine their own way of choosing the quota of representatives assigned to them in any category, the Lutheran Churches which join in this petition propose to proceed through their "World Confessional Organization" to choose their representatives. That is to say, they will employ a combination of the first and third principles of representation provided by the present constitution. In this way the proposed amendment will help the World Council to be what it professes to be.

II. Because of what the World Council proposes to do.

(1) One important function of the World Council will always be to mobilize the witness of the Church of Christ for concrete prophetic action, both in general and in particular cases. The Lutheran Churches uniting in this petition are strongly convinced that they can bear their witness with more effect and can contribute to ecumenical prophetic action with more force if they are permitted to do this in unison within the World Council than if they act separately and apart from the World Council. This witness to the Christian truth as they see it, whether in an occasional message or in a continuing testimony, the Lutheran Churches of the world can best achieve through harmony of voice among themselves; and their co-operation in common Christian action they can best accomplish through a solidarity of official representatives chosen directly by themselves.

(2) Moreover, it is our conviction that the World Council itself will move more quickly and more certainly toward a united testimony before the world if the Churches themselves associated in confessional groups are permitted to speak frankly with one another in friendly comparison of views,--far more quickly and more certainly than if Christians speak with one another as national or geographical groups. The way to a united Christian testimony before the world of today would be rendered even more difficult by sectionalism than by sectarianism.

We realize that certain benefits to the Christian cause are to be gained by the exchange of experiences and ideas not only across confessional boundaries but also across national and regional boundaries; but we are convinced that this exchange can be achieved more effectively within "world confessional organizations" (Constitution) than through international gatherings representing the various political or territorial divisions of the world.

(3) Through this principle of confessional representation in the Assembly and the Central Committee it seems certain that if this petition is granted at least six additional Lutheran Churches in America will at once accept the invitation to join the World Council and help bear a united Christian testimony.

In these ways the suggested amendment will help the World Council to do what it proposes to do.

We are persuaded that this extension of the principle of confessional representation can be made and that it can be achieved without upsetting the geographical balance within the World Council or its parts and without inequity to any of the other interests of the World Council. We have carefully considered the practical difficulties that on first thought might seem to stand in the way of granting this petition, and we are prepared to consider them in further detail with any subcommittee that might be appointed for the purpose.

--Christendom, Vol. XI, No. 3, Summer, 1946, pp. 360-362.

Bishop Berggrav's Memorandum Concerning Confessional Representation

It is very difficult to take up one's definite position with regard to the question of confessional representation before further rules exist for the realization of the outlines drawn up in the Constitution V:1 and 2. Much depends on the question how the seats in the Assembly and the Central Committee apportioned to the European countries shall be allocated and how the election shall be made. As a matter of fact most of the questions are open. Therefore it is not easy at the present time to have any opinion of the problem, to what degree the confessional regard will be met.

The Scandinavian Churches for their part will hardly feel any strong need for a representation along confessional lines. When a regional representation is realized we could presume that each of the Scandinavian Churches /National Churches/ will be represented in the Assembly and in the Central Committee. It is not so certain that this will be the case if the principle of confessional representation shall be maintained. For the Scandinavian Churches anyhow this line will make conditions more uncertain. It may be objected that the Scandinavian Churches are so alike that they could be represented by each other. It is, however, not only a limited question of competence. In spite of all likeness and all kinship between the Scandinavian Churches we would feel it to be - from a factual point of view - unsatisfactory if one or more of the Scandinavian Churches would be without representation. Our Churches do not feel that they are a confessional quantity which can simply be melt together with other Lutheran units. From some point of view they are independent bodies. Each of them has grown together with its own people, it has its own tradition and its special character. We consider this to be a big thing and we assume that these conditions will make it a natural thing that each of the Scandinavian Churches will get its own representation in the Assembly and in the Central Committee. This representation ought to be direct and not an indirect one, it should not go through a confessional Lutheran fellowship.

In this connection we want to mention a hesitation more founded on principle. A representation along confessional lines seems to presume a confessional uniformity that hardly corresponds to the factual situation, and it could promote a confessional uniformity which is hardly desirable and which is at bottom unlutheran. On this point there is an essential difference between the Greek- Orthodox Church and the Lutheran Churches. All confessional common feeling and unity is valuable and fruitful, but confessional block-buildings, mainly formed after usual political pattern are quite another thing. Under the special circumstances existing in the U.S.A. where different daughter Churches of European national Churches have grown up side by side in the new nation Lutheranism may be forced to form such block-buildings. This development, however, ought not to react on the original Lutheran national Churches. In them not only the historical confession but also the structure of the actual life determines the character of the Church. These national Churches can and should not merge in a joint representation. - Nor can we leave out of consideration that Lutheranism will have a stronger voice in the world choir of Churches if it has the bigger richness in colour and shading of the individual

Churches than if it - like the Orthodox Church - shall have one single common voice.

After what has been stated here there seems to be reason for careful consideration if the confessional regard will not be sufficiently provided for with the stipulation about representatives of the minority according to the decision of the confessional world organization in question. Eventually there could be a question of increasing the number of the representatives belonging to this class.

/ This memorandum is written by Pastor Henrik Hauge after discussion with Bishop Berggrav and dated Oslo, June 29, 1946./

--Copy of Memorandum in personal files of Dr. Wentz, Gettysburg

Michelfelder: What Do You Mean By "Ecumenical"?

What do you mean by "ecumenical"? That is a fair question to ask of anyone who uses this word. There is a wide divergence of meaning and emphasis in these days. With the approach of the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam next August, the term will be used more and more, and definitions will vary in proportion.

At Lund, the delegates agreed unanimously to revise the constitution of the Lutheran World Federation to read under Article III as one of the purposes: "To foster Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements." Note it reads "foster," not only study and observe, but actively to foster participation.

Thus the Executive Committee has appointed the executive secretary as representative to the World Council at Geneva, and the Assembly has designated him as consultative delegate for the Federation to both the Amsterdam Assembly and the Central Committee. This much is clear, the Lutheran World Federation, representing the largest Protestant group of churches belonging to the World Council of Churches has solemnly pledged itself to foster Lutheran participation.

By participation we certainly mean that the Lutheran Church is willing to become one of the pillars on which the

World Council must stand if it is to be a real ecumenical council. Let no one read into this provision of the constitution that this paragraph "d" of Article III will annul other paragraphs of our constitution under the same article, such as: (a) "To bear united witness before the world to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the power of God for salvation" or (b) "To cultivate unity of faith and confession among the Lutheran Churches of the world" or (c) "To promote fellowship and cooperation in study among Lutherans."

These purposes of the Federation will never be sacrificed for any other purpose. By "fostering participation" we will insist on remaining true to our convictions which have been forged as in a furnace. Today we must confess "The Truth" in a confused world. The Lutheran Church is ecumenical.

We do believe that there is a "communion of saints," "the Holy Christian or Catholic Church." We do not teach nor believe that salvation comes only through the Lutheran Church. On the other hand, we are not ready to join those who want to reduce all denominations to a least common denominator of doctrinal agreement and form a new church universal. There are those who think this is necessary to ecumenicity. Such addled thinking would not produce a church, but only another denomination whose credo would be but one digit above zero. The World Council of Churches would soon go the way of all "air castles" if it is to be suspended to such sky hooks. No, let the ecumenical movements of the world stand on the pillars of the churches whose members know not only what they believe but in Whom they believe.

One of the most important issues at stake at the Assembly in Amsterdam is the question of confessional representation. There will be "ecumaniacs" who will want to make a "puree" out of the World Council of Churches in which Anglicans, Lutherans, Methodists, Greek Orthodox, Presbyterians and so forth will lose their identity. Let those who have no convictions than that it is expedient to unite do so.

That there are too many denominations and unnecessary divisions every one will admit. But this is no time for superficial thinking. Now is the time for all men, clergy and laity, to restudy the Word of God and their own confessions. If this produces loyalty to confessions it is of God and no temporary advantage for expediency's sake dare change such convictions.

Lutheran delegates to Amsterdam should come as Lutheran delegates, representing their churches officially and not some nebulous, non-existant, invisible body of geographic sections.

Let the World Council of Churches be a council of churches. As churches we can work together, study together without sacrificing our identity or our confessions. This is ecumenical as we understand the word. To this end we propose to "foster participation in ecumenical movements."

--Lutheran Messenger, March 9, 1948, p. 4.
"What Do You Mean By 'Ecumenical'?" by
Dr. S. C. Michelfelder, Executive Secretary,
Lutheran World Federation.

APPENDIX IV

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Almond, Mrs. Josephine K. ULCA delegate to the Amsterdam Assembly of the WCC, 1948.

Aasgaard, Johan Arnd. Born 1876 in Albert Lea, Minn. Studied at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn., the United Church Seminary, Minneapolis, Princeton Seminary, Princeton, N.J. and Wisconsin University. Pastorates in the United Church and the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America 1901-25. President Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn. 1911-25. President of the ELC (prior to 1946 the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America) from 1925 to 1954. Member of the Executive Committee of the LWC and the LWF since 1943.

Bergendoff, Conrad. President of the Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois since 1935; also of the Augustana Seminary until 1949 when the two schools were divided. AugS delegate to the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences in 1937. Elected to the Faith and Order Continuation Committee 1937. Consultant to the WCC's Evanston Assembly 1954. Author: I Believe in the Church, 1937; Christ as Authority, 1947; The One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, 1954.

Bergin, Alfred. AugS delegate to the Edinburgh Conference, 1937.

Bersell, Petrus Olaf. Born May 8, 1882 in Rock Island, Ill. Graduated from Augustana College and Seminary. President of the Augustana Lutheran Church (prior to 1949 the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America) from 1935 to 1951. To Europe in 1945 helping to renew the LWC and prepare way for vast post-war relief program. Member of the Provisional Committee of the WCC 1946-48 and of the Central Committee since 1948. AugS delegate to the WCC's Amsterdam and Evanston Assemblies.

Brandelle, Gustaf Albert. President of the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America, 1918-35. AugS delegate to the Stockholm Conference, 1925.

Burntvedt, T. O. President of the Lutheran Free Church since 1930. Co-opted member of the Lausanne Conference, 1927.

Clutz, J. A. ULCA delegate to the Stockholm Conference. Hospitalized in Stockholm as the result of injuries received in an accident in that city. Died of a heart attack just as he was about to return to America following the close of the 1925 Conference.

Dysinger, Holmes. Dean and Professor of Systematic Theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebr. ULCA delegate to the Stockholm Conference. Member of the ULCA's Commission on Faith and Order, 1925-32.

Flack, E. E. Professor of Exegetical Theology at Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio since 1923; Dean since 1940. Member of ULCA's Commission on Faith and Order, 1932-1948. ULCA delegate to the Edinburgh Conference, 1937.

Franke, J. B. ULCA delegate to the Stockholm Conference.

Fry, Franklin Clark. Born August 30, 1900 in Bethlehem, Pa. Graduated from Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y. 1921. Studied at the American School for Classical Studies in Athens, Greece, 1921. Graduated from the Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary, 1925. Pastorates in New York and Ohio, 1925-44. President of the United Lutheran Church in America since 1944. Member of the LWC and LWF Executive Committee since 1945. First Vice-President of the LWF since 1952. ULCA delegate to the Amsterdam and Evanston Assemblies of the WCC. Vice-Chairman of the WCC Central Committee, 1948-54; Chairman since 1954. Vice-Chairman of the United States Conference for the WCC.

Greever, Walton Harlow. Born December 18, 1870 at Burkes Garden, Va. Pastorates in W. Va. and S.C., 1896-1908. Editor of the Lutheran Church Visitor, 1904-14. In 1914 founded the American Lutheran Survey, serving as its editor and general manager. From 1922 to 1933 Professor of Ethics and Science of Religion at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Columbia, S.C. Member of the ULCA's Commission on Faith and Order, 1928-48. Member of the ULCA's Executive Board, 1922-30; 1932-47. Secretary of the ULCA, 1932-47. ULCA delegate to the Lausanne Conference. Appointed delegate to Edinburgh in 1937 but was unable to attend.

Herman, Stewart Winfield. Pastor of interdenominational American Church in Berlin, Germany, 1936-41. From the outbreak of World War II until December 1941 also served as a member of the American Embassy staff in Berlin. Special lecturer at Hamma Divinity School 1943. With Office of Strategic Service of the U.S. Government, 1943-44. Deputy director of the Department of Reconstruction of the WCC, 1945-47. Later was head of the LWF Service to Refugees which by July 1951 had helped resettle some 80,000 to 90,000 Lutheran refugees. From October 1953 Executive Secretary of the LWF's Committee on Latin America and Executive Secretary of the NLC's Division on Lutheran Cooperation in Latin America. Since 1956 Executive Secretary of the "Division of Lutheran World Federation Affairs," including the Department of Lutheran Cooperation in Latin America, the Department of World Missions, the Department of World Service, and the Department of Theology. ULCA delegate to the Evanston Assembly of the WCC.

Jacobs, Charles M. Born 1875 at Gettysburg, Pa. Professor of History, Muhlenberg College, 1905-09. Professor of Church History and Director of Graduate School at the Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary, 1913-27; President of the Seminary, 1927-1938. Co-Author with Dr. F. H. Knubel of the ULCA's Washington Declaration. Member of the War Service Committee of the Federal Council of Churches. Vice-President of the National Lutheran Commission for Soldiers' and Sailors' Welfare. Member of the ULCA's Commission on Faith and Order, 1925-38. Died March 30, 1938.

Jensen, Alfred. President of the AELC (prior to 1952 the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America). DELC delegate to the Amsterdam Assembly of the WCC.

Knubel, Frederick Hermann. Born in New York City May 22, 1870. Graduated from Gettysburg College, 1893, and from the Gettysburg Seminary, 1895. Studied at the University of Leipzig, Germany, 1895-1896. Organizer and pastor of the Church of the Atonement in New York City, 1896-1918. President of the National Lutheran Commission for Soldiers' and Sailors' Welfare during World War I. Member of the General Synod's Committee for Faith and Order. First President of the United Lutheran Church in America, 1918-44. Influential in organizing of the NLC and of the LWC. From 1935 until his death in 1945 he was first Vice-President of the LWC. Co-author with C. M. Jacobs of the ULCA's Washington Declaration. The guiding spirit in ULCA deliberations on ecumenical relationships. Delegate to the 1938 Utrecht conference which drew up the provisional constitution of the WCC. Died October 16, 1945.

Larsen, N. Astrup. Missionary to China from 1913-27. For some years a member of the China Continuation Committee formed under the guidance of Dr. John R. Mott following the 1910 World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh. Following his return to America has served as president of the ELC's

Iowa District, subsequently of the South Central District. A strong advocate of ELC membership in the WCC. Co-Author of Should We Join The World Council of Churches? 1948 in which he presented the case in favor of affiliation.

Long, Ralph H. Born near Loudonville, Ohio in 1882. Educated at Capital University and Theological Seminary in Columbus, Ohio. Pastorates in Ohio and Pennsylvania, 1909-1927. Stewardship Secretary of the Joint Synod of Ohio, 1927-1930. Executive Director of the NLC, 1930-1948. Member of the Executive Committee of the LWC and the LWF. Keynote speaker at the Lund Assembly of the LWF, 1947. In 1945 made two trips to Europe in behalf of the American Section of the LWC playing a prominent role in the renewal of the LWC after World War II and in preparing for relief and rehabilitation work in war-torn Europe. Chairman of Sub-Committee for Europe of the Church Committee on Overseas Relief and Reconstruction which represented churches of America as they collaborated with the WCC's Department of Reconstruction. Second Vice-President of the ALC, 1946-1948. Delegate to the Utrecht conference which drew up the provisional constitution of the WCC, 1938. Died February 18, 1948.

Malmin, O. G. Editor of the Lutheran Herald, official publication of the ELC. Author of numerous articles on the question of possible ELC membership in the WCC.

Michelfelder, Sylvester C. Born 1889. Pastorates in the Joint Synod of Ohio and ALC churches in Ohio and Pennsylvania. For some years superintendent of the Lutheran Inner Mission Society in Pittsburgh, Pa. From 1945 to 1947 Chairman of the Material Aid Division of the Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid of the WCC, having played a major role in the organizing of this Department. Chief European representative of the American Section of the LWC from July 1945. From 1946 until 1951 Executive Secretary of the Lutheran World Federation. Died September 30, 1951.

Morehead, John Alfred. Born in Pulaski County, Virginia, February 4, 1867. A.B. Roanoke College, 1889. Graduated from the Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary, 1892. Pastorates in Virginia, 1892-1898. President Southern Theological Seminary, 1898-1903. Graduate study at the Universities of Leipzig and Berlin. President Roanoke College, 1903-1919. From 1910-1914 president of the United Lutheran Synod of the South. In 1919 headed commission of the NLC to investigate the condition of Lutherans in post-war Europe. Subsequently directed vast Lutheran relief program in Europe. Played a prominent role in the calling of the Lutheran World Convention in 1923. Chairman of the LWC Executive Committee, 1923-1929. Full time president of the LWC, 1929-1935. Died June 1, 1936.

Nelson, Clifford Ansgar. AugS delegate to the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences, 1937.

Nilson, Nils A. AugS delegate to the Amsterdam Assembly, 1948.

Nolde, O. Frederick. Dean of the Graduate School of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pa. A member of the Department of International Justice and Goodwill and of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of Churches and subsequently of the NCCCUSA. Director of the WCC's Commission of Churches for International Affairs. A contributor to the "Amsterdam Series" of preparatory study materials for the First Assembly. After the Amsterdam Assembly, which he served as a consultant, he was appointed one of the WCC's five Associate General Secretaries with the portfolio of International Affairs.

Nyholm, Paul. UELC delegate to the Amsterdam Assembly, 1948.

Ofstedal, R. A. ELC pastor at Decorah, Iowa. Vigorous opponent of ELC membership in the WCC. Co-Author of Should We Join The World Council Of Churches? 1948, in which he presented arguments against affiliation.

Pfatteicher, E. P. ULCA delegate to the Stockholm Conference, 1925. Member of the ULCA Executive Board 1932-1940. President of the Pennsylvania Ministerium. Died 1943.

Preus, Herman. Fraternal Visitor from the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America to the Edinburgh Conference, 1937.

Rast, G. AugS delegate to the Stockholm Conference, 1925.

Scherer, M. G. G. President of the United Synod in the South at the time of the 1918 merger forming the ULCA. Secretary of the ULCA, 1918-1932. ULCA delegate to the Stockholm and Lausanne Conferences. Member of the ULCA's Commission on Faith and Order, 1925-1932. Died March 9, 1932.

Sigmond, S. O. A pastor of the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America at the Lausanne Conference as a co-opted member. A Fraternal Visitor to the Edinburgh Conference.

Sletten, O. H. A co-opted member of the Stockholm Conference. Pastor of the Lutheran Free Church.

Stoughton, Clarence C. Stewardship Secretary of the ULCA, 1945-1949. President Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio since 1949. ULCA delegate to the Amsterdam and Evanston Assemblies of the WCC.

Steimle, Augustus. Born July 23, 1870. ULCA pastor in New York. Member of the ULCA's Executive Board, 1918-1928; of the ULCA's Commission on Faith and Order, 1927-1937. ULCA delegate to the Edinburgh Conference, 1937. Died September 30, 1937.

Wentz, Abdel Ross. Born in York County, Pa., October 8, 1883. Graduated from Gettysburg College in 1904 and from the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg in 1907. Studied at the Universities of Leipzig, Berlin and Tübingen, 1907-1910. Received his Ph.D. from George Washington University in 1914. From 1909 to 1916 professor of History at Gettysburg College. From 1916 to 1956 professor of Church History at the Gettysburg Seminary. President of the Seminary, 1940-1951. Member of the ULCA Executive Board, 1924-1932. Member of ULCA's Commission on Faith and Order, 1932-1948. ULCA delegate to the Edinburgh Conference, 1937 and to the Amsterdam Assembly of the WCC, 1948. At the Edinburgh Conference he was named to the Faith and Order Continuation Committee and to its Executive Committee, and as a member of the Committee of Fourteen. From 1938 to 1948 a member of the Provisional Committee of the WCC. A leading figure in the LWC and the LWF. Author of the LWC's 1936 statement on "Lutherans and Ecumenical Movements." Main architect and writer of the LWF constitution adopted in 1947. Member of the Executive Committee of the LWC and LWF from 1935 to 1952; Honorary Member since 1952. Author: The Lutheran Church in American History, 1923 and 1933. A Basic History of Lutheranism in America, 1955. Author of numerous other books and articles.

Yochum, Harold. President Capital University, Columbus, Ohio. ALC delegate to Amsterdam and Evanston Assembles of the WCC.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bachmann, E. Theodore, *Epic of Faith, The Background of the Second Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation, 1952*. The National Lutheran Council, New York, 1952.

The Christian Century, 1918-1956, Chicago, Illinois.

Christianity and Crisis, Volume VIII, 1948, New York, N.Y.

Convictions, A Selection from the Responses of the Churches to the Report of the World Conference on Faith and Order Held at Lausanne in 1927, Edited by Leonard Hodgson with the assistance of H. N. Bate and Ralph W. Brown. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1934.

Correspondence, papers, and reports in the personal files of Dr. Abdel Ross Wentz, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Correspondence in the files of the World Council of Churches, New York office, New York.

Correspondence with Dr. Floyd W. Tomkins, Washington, Connecticut.

Doctrinal Declarations, A Collection of Official Statements on the Doctrinal Position of Various Lutheran Synods in America. The Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.

Documents of the World Council of Churches, First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Amsterdam 1948.

Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 68, October 24, 1932.

Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 69, March 1933.

Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 79, 1936.

Faith and Order, Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927, Edited by H. N. Bate. Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York, 1928.

The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches Held at Amsterdam August 22nd to September 4th, 1948, The Official Report, Edited by W. A. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1949.

Jacobs, C. M., "The Washington Declaration: An Interpretation," *The Lutheran Church Review*, Volume XL, 1921, pp. 1-21.

Knubel, F. H., "Essentials Of A Catholic Spirit," *The Lutheran Church Review*, Volume XXXVIII, 1919, pp. 185-197.

Larsen, N. Astrup, and Ofstedal, R. A., *Should We Join The World Council of Churches?* Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, 1948.

The Lutheran, 1918-1948. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. [Weekly Church Paper of the United Lutheran Church in America.]

The Lutheran Companion, 1918-1955. Rock Island, Illinois. [Weekly Church Paper of the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America, since 1949 the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church.]

Lutheran Herald, 1918-1948. Minneapolis, Minnesota. [Weekly Church Paper of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, since 1946 the Evangelical Lutheran Church.]

Lutheran Messenger, 1918-1948. Minneapolis, Minnesota. [Bi-weekly Church Paper of the Lutheran Free Church.]

The Lutheran Outlook, 1938-1948. [Monthly publication of the American Lutheran Conference.]

Lutheran Standard, 1918-1948. Columbus, Ohio. [Weekly Church Paper of the American Lutheran Church, prior to 1930 of the Joint Synod of Ohio.]

The Lutheran World Almanac and Encyclopedia, 1934-1937, Volume VIII, Compiled by G. L. Kieffer, C. K. Fegley, O. M. Norlie, W. H. B. Carney, Editorial Committee: Ralph H. Long, W. H. Greever, F. H. Meyer, M. Jorgensen, H. Halvorson, G. C. Olson. Published and Copyrighted by The National Lutheran Council, New York, 1937.

Macfarland, Charles S., *Steps Toward The World Council*. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1938.

Man's Disorder And God's Design, The Amsterdam Assembly Series, A one-volume edition of four books including I. The Universal Church in God's Design, II. The Church's Witness to God's Design, III. The Church and the Disorder of Society, IV. The Church and the International Disorder. Harper & Brothers, New York.

Memorandum on World Council of Churches adopted by the Administrative Committee of the Baptist World Alliance at its session in London, January 31, 1938. [Copy of mimeographed Memorandum in files of Dr. Wentz, Gettysburg.]

Minutes of the Meeting of the American Section of the Lutheran World Convention, March 22, 1946. [Copy in files of Dr. Wentz, Gettysburg.]

Minutes of the Meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, September 4th to 6th, 1948, at Woudschoten, The Netherlands. [In mimeographed form.]

Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on the Arrangements for the Assembly, The World Council of Churches, St. Julians, Horsham, July 31st-August 1st, 1946. [Copy of mimeographed Minutes in files of World Council, New York.]

Minutes of the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, Berne, Switzerland, August 23-25, 1926.

Minutes of the Informal Meeting at the National Arts Club, 15 Gramercy Park, N.Y. City, April 1, 1938, 4:30-9:00 P.M. of the delegates to the Utrecht Provisional Conference. [Mimeographed copy in files of World Council, New York.]

Minutes and Reports of the Meeting of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches, Buck Hill Falls, Penn., April 1947.

Minutes of the American Lutheran Church, 1930-1948.

Minutes of the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 1918-1948. [Since 1952 the American Evangelical Lutheran Church.]

Minutes of the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America, 1911-1948. [Since 1949 the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church.]

Minutes of the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church (*Suomi Synod*), 1938-1948.

Minutes of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, 1911-1918.

Minutes of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America, 1911-1918.

Minutes of the Lutheran Free Church, 1918-1948.

Minutes of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, 1918-1948. [Since 1946 the Evangelical Lutheran Church]

Minutes of the United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 1918-1948. [Since 1946 the United Evangelical Lutheran Church]

Minutes of the United Lutheran Church in America, 1918-1948.

Minutes of the Executive Board of the United Lutheran Church in America, 1918-1948.

Minutes of the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South, 1912-1918.

Minutes of the National Lutheran Council, 1938-1948.

News Bulletins issued by the National Lutheran Council.

Niederschrift über die Verhandlung des Executivkomittees des Lutherischen Weltkonvents geschehen im Kirchenratssaal der Ev. Luth. Kirche am Spui zu Amsterdam, Handboogstraat 6, vom 24. bis 28. August 1937. [Copy of mimeographed Minutes in the files of Dr. Wentz, Gettysburg.]

North American Preparatory Conference, Garden City, Long Island, New York, U.S.A., January 4-6, 1916. Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 30.

Oldham, J. H., *The Oxford Conference (Official Report)*, Willett, Clark & Co., Chicago and New York, 1937.

Pepper, George Wharton, "A World Conference on Questions of Faith and Order," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, Volume XLI, 1911, pp. 165-170.

A Preliminary Conference, The World Conference for the Consideration of Questions Touching Faith and Order. Printed for the Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church, A.D. 1913. Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 24.

Proceedings of The Lutheran World Federation Assembly, Lund, Sweden, June 30 - July 6, 1947. The Lutheran World Federation, 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland, Dr. S. C. Michelfelder, Executive Secretary. The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa., 1948.

Remensnyder, J. B., "The Basic Call for the Conference on Church Unity," *The Constructive Quarterly*, Volume IV, 1916, pp. 151-159.

Report of the Committee on Plan and Scope of the Joint Commission to Arrange for a World Conference on Faith and Order, Adopted April 20, 1911, Published July 1911. Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 3.

Report of the Joint Commission to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1913. Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 23.

Report of the Joint Commission to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1916. Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 31.

Report of the Preliminary Meeting at Geneva, Switzerland, August 12-20, 1920. Faith and Order Pamphlet No. 33.

Rouse, Ruth, and Neill, Stephen Charles, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948*, Published on Behalf of the Ecumenical Institute, Chateau De Bossey. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1954.

Schaff, Philip, *The Creeds of Christendom*, Sixth Edition, Volume II, Harper and Brother, New York, 1919.

Schmauk, T. E., "The Garden City Conference on Faith and Order," *The Lutheran Church Review*, Volume XXXV, 1916, pp. 178-186.

The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Held At Edinburgh, August 3-18, 1937, Edited by Leonard Hodgson. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938.

The Stockholm Conference, 1925, The Official Report of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work Held in Stockholm, 19-30 August, 1925, Edited by G. K. A. Bell. Oxford University Press, London.

Wentz, Abdel Ross, *A Basic History of Lutheranism in America*. Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1955.

Wentz, Abdel Ross, Editor, *The Lutheran Churches of the World, 1952*. Published by The Lutheran World Federation, 17 Route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland.

Wentz, A. R., Flack, E. E., and Steimle, A., "Edinburgh: The Second World's Conference on Faith and Order," *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Volume X, No. 4, October 1937, pp. 341-364.

What Lutherans Are Thinking, Edited by E. C. Fendt, The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio, 1947.

Wickey, Gould, "Has Oxford Spoken to Our Condition? An Interpretation of the Oxford Ecumenical Conference," *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Volume X, No. 4, October 1937, pp. 333-340.

The World Council of Churches, Its Process of Formation, Minutes and reports of the meeting of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches held at Geneva from February 21st to 23rd, 1946; the constitutional documents of the World Council of Churches and an introduction by W. A. Visser 't Hooft. World Council of Churches, Geneva, Switzerland, 1946.

"World Council Representation by Families of Churches, A Discussion by Floyd Tomkins, Franklin Clark Fry, Earl Frederick Adams, Ivan Lee Holt, and A. L. Warnshuis," *Christendom*, Volume XI, No. 3, Summer 1946, pp. 356-372.

World Lutheranism of Today, A Tribute to Anders Nygren, November 15, 1950. Svenska Kyrkan Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, Stockholm, Lund, 1950.

World Missionary Conference, 1910, The History and Records of the Conference. Edinburgh, 1910.

Zabriskie, Alexander C., *Bishop Brent, Crusader for Christian Unity*. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1948.